DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 439 275 CE 079 919

AUTHOR	Bliss, Steven
TITLE	San Francisco Works: Toward an Employer-Led Approach to Welfare Reform and Workforce Development. Connections to Work.
INSTITUTION	Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	59p.; For more information on a business-led initiative for welfare reform or welfare reform and employer involvement, see ED 414 442 and ED 418 335.
AVAILABLE FROM	Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 16 East 34 Street, New York, New York 10016. Tel: 212-532-3200.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Cooperative Programs; Education Work Relationship; Employer Attitudes; *Employment Programs; Institutional Cooperation; *Job Training; Outcomes of Education; Partnerships in Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; School Business Relationship; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	*California (San Francisco); *Welfare to Work Programs

ABSTRACT

San Francisco Works (SFWorks) is a collaborative welfare-to-work project conducted by a coalition of large San Francisco-area employers, the city's Chamber of Commerce, and the United Way of the Bay Area. The project was piloted beginning in March 1998 by contracting with five community-based organizations (CBOs) to provide a comprehensive range of job training services. It was expected that the CBOs would build their own relationships with employers, but those relationships did not materialize in most cases. Of the 99 enrollees in the first phase, 51 were placed in jobs. In the second cycle of the project, SFWorks actively brokered relationships between businesses and training organizations. With one of the employers experiencing a sudden hiring freeze, the second phase of the project resulted in placement of 60 of 115 trainees. In May 1999, the third cycle of training and placement began, using the components that had worked well in the second phase. Some lessons learned by the project included the following: (1) private sector-led intermediaries that focus on employment of welfare recipients can succeed with a variety of employers; (2) private sector intermediaries can build relationships with employers by framing welfare-to-work efforts in business terms; (3) there is a crucial distinction between "business-backed" and "employer-led" initiatives; and (4) paid internships and mentoring are motivating factors for welfare-to-work participants. (KC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 439 275

CONNECTIONS TO WORK

San Francisco Works

Toward an Employer-Led Approach to Welfare Reform and Workforce Development

Steven Bliss

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J.S. Griessman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CE 079 919

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MDRC

MDRC Board of Directors

PAUL H. O'NEILL, *Chairman*
Chairman
Alcoa

ROBERT SOLOW, *Vice Chairman*
Institute Professor
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

RUDOLPH G. PENNER, *Treasurer*
Senior Fellow
Urban Institute

MARY JO BANE
Professor of Public Policy
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

JAMES H. JOHNSON, JR.
E. Maynard Adams Professor of Business, Geography, and Sociology
Director, Urban Investment Strategies Center
University of North Carolina

ANNA KONDRATAS
Senior Associate
Urban Institute

RICHARD J. MURNANE
Professor of Education
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

MARION O. SANDLER
Chairman and CEO
Golden West Financial Corporation and World Savings and Loan Association

ISABEL V. SAWHILL
Senior Fellow
Brookings Institution

LAWRENCE J. STUPSKI
Chairman
Stupski Family Foundation

WILLIAM JULIUS WILSON
Malcolm Wiener Professor of Social Policy
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

JUDITH M. GUERON
President
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

MDRC

CONNECTIONS TO WORK

San Francisco Works

Toward an Employer-Led Approach
to Welfare Reform and
Workforce Development

Steven Bliss

March 2000

MDRC 4

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

THE CONNECTIONS TO WORK PROJECT IS FUNDED BY THE CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION AND THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION. DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLICATION OF THIS CASE STUDY WERE SUPPORTED BY THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION.

Dissemination of MDRC publications is also supported by MDRC's Public Policy Outreach funders: the Ford Foundation, the Ambrose Monell Foundation, the Alcoa Foundation, and the James Irvine Foundation.

The findings and conclusions presented in this document do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the funders.

For information about MDRC and copies of our publications, see our Web site:
www.mdrc.org

MDRC® is a registered trademark of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Copyright © 2000 by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

Preface v

Acknowledgments vii

Executive Summary 1

Key Lessons 3

Community Context 5
- The Bay Area Economy 5
- Welfare-to-Work in San Francisco 6

Creating SFWorks 7
- Impetus for Business Backing 7
- Early Research and Planning 7
- Fine-Tuning the Program Design 9
- Staffing SFWorks 10

The SFWorks Pilot Phase 11
- Capacity-Building for CBOs 13
- ETP Funds 14
- Relationships with Public Agencies 15

The Pilot Phase: Major Setbacks, Clear Lessons 16
- Recruitment, Orientation, Appraisal 16
- Pilot-Phase Training Programs 18
- Training and Placement of the Pilot Class 18
- Capacity-Building for CBOs 21
- First-Year Revenue and Expenses 23

The Second Cycle of SFWorks 24
- Toward an Employer-Led Approach 24
- Recruitment, Orientation, Appraisal 29
- Outcomes from the Second Cycle 29
- Emerging Relationships with Public Sector Partners 31
- Results of ETP Funding 32

The Third Cycle of SFWorks 34
Third-Cycle Training Programs 35
Post-Pilot-Phase Revenue and Expenses 35

SFWorks: An Update 36
Fund Development Efforts 36
Organizational Governance 37

SFWorks Looks Ahead 38
Increasing Program Capacity 38
Moving Away from Capacity-Building for CBOs 40

Conclusion 41

Recent Publications on MDRC Projects 43

PREFACE

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 ended the 60-year-old Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program and replaced it with block grants to states known as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). The law gives states great flexibility in using TANF funds but also includes strict work requirements and time limits on welfare recipients' receipt of federally funded cash benefits. These changes intensify the need for innovative approaches to encourage and assist welfare recipients in their move toward employment and economic self-sufficiency.

In response to these new challenges, the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) is conducting the Connections to Work project with support from The Rockefeller Foundation and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. With a focus on cutting-edge initiatives, the project aims to help emerging public-private partnerships, local organizations, and agencies plan for change and to develop practical lessons about new approaches to the provision of employment services.

This case study—the third in the Connections to Work series—was supported by The Rockefeller Foundation. It tells the story of San Francisco Works, a nonprofit organization founded in 1997 to support the San Francisco business community's involvement in welfare-to-work activities. San Francisco Works was established as a partnership between the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the Committee on Jobs (a coalition of the city's 35 largest businesses), and the United Way of the Bay Area. This new organization was created with two goals in mind: creating a stronger linkage between job market needs and employment training programs, and giving welfare recipients access to jobs with wages high enough to make work truly more attractive than welfare. By emphasizing intensive, employer-based training in specific job-related skills, San Francisco Works has helped develop training programs in such fields as health care, legal services, financial services, insurance services, and automotive repair.

This case study describes the inception and first two years of an organization that works to engage businesses directly in job training for welfare recipients. San Francisco Works' experience offers a range of lessons for any organization—private or public—that aims to take a similar intermediary role. These lessons include the importance of cultivating substantive, sustainable relationships with employers and employer groups, the need for extensive employer input in curriculum planning and design, and the significant benefits that training participants can derive from paid pre-employment internships and individualized mentoring.

Overall, this case study points to the great community benefits—and challenges—of strengthening the connection between employment development efforts and the demands of the job market. We hope that the lessons provided here will be valuable to all those interested in innovative welfare-to-work strategies.

Judith M. Gueron
President

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This case study could not have taken shape without the contributions of many people. I am very grateful to Heather Hiles and the entire staff at San Francisco Works, who provided me with timely, detailed input throughout the project. Special thanks go to Jill Minkus and Rachel Jordan, both of whose wit and congeniality more than withstood my countless requests for information.

Valuable observations and insight also were provided by staff at the San Francisco Department of Human Services, graduates of San Francisco Works, San Francisco Works' training organizations and business partners, members of the San Francisco Works Board of Directors, BTW Consultants, and staff at the Committee on Jobs and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. Kristi Laughlin at the Bar Association of San Francisco, Karen Shawcross at Bank of America, and Abby Snay at Jewish Vocational Service all reviewed sections of this study.

Julia Lopez and Betsy Biemann at The Rockefeller Foundation read drafts and provided feedback that strengthened the case study overall and helped clarify the discussion of key lessons in particular.

At MDRC, John Wallace provided invaluable guidance at every stage of the project, read various drafts, and consistently helped sharpen the focus of the case study. Fred Doolittle and Robert Ivry reviewed drafts and offered thoughtful and extensive comments. Maggie Feinstein's assistance and support were truly indispensable. Bob Weber expertly edited the study.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Lori Bamberger, whose white paper on San Francisco Works' formative stages not only laid the groundwork for this case study but also set a high standard for thoroughness and clarity.

The Author

Executive Summary

San Francisco Works (SFWorks)—a collaboration among the Committee on Jobs (a coalition of San Francisco's 35 largest businesses), the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and the United Way of the Bay Area—was established in 1997 to coordinate the San Francisco business community's involvement in local welfare-to-work efforts. SFWorks initially set out to achieve two key objectives: (1) creating job training programs closely tied to real workforce needs, and with the participation of actual employers; and (2) helping welfare recipients obtain jobs with wages high enough to make entry-level work more financially attractive than welfare. SFWorks also planned to use performance-based payments (for job training services) as a way of motivating community-based organizations to run more efficient training programs.

Initial funding for SFWorks came primarily from the business community and private foundations. Several of San Francisco's largest businesses—including Bank of America, Charles Schwab & Co., The Gap, Pacific Telesis, and Wells Fargo Bank—made three-year commitments for as much as $250,000, while The Rockefeller Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the F.B. Heron Foundation, and the Cahill Foundation all provided major start-up funds. In light of this substantial level of support, SFWorks initially planned to avoid any reliance on public funds. This changed, however, when SFWorks decided to seek funds through the state Employment Training Panel (ETP) as a way of boosting the program's ability to pay wages to participants during training. SFWorks' initial contract with ETP totaled more than $3 million. (As it turned out, SFWorks would ultimately receive only a small fraction of this amount, largely because of the general incompatibility between SFWorks' program design and the strict stipulations attached to ETP funds.)

In March 1998, SFWorks launched its pilot phase of training, intended to test the initial program design. SFWorks contracted with five community-based organizations (CBOs) to provide a comprehensive range of job training services, from appraisal to placement and retention. SFWorks during the pilot phase expected (based on the CBOs' program proposals and descriptions of their expertise) that CBOs would build on their *own* stated relationships with employers in designing training and creating job placements. For most of the CBOs involved in the pilot phase, these relationships did not materialize. The overall results of the pilot phase were somewhat disappointing, with 51 of 99 enrollees being placed in jobs. However, with the relative success of the two programs where CBOs *did* have relationships with employers, SFWorks learned to move forward with a more employer-driven set of training programs.

This shift in SFWorks' basic approach was represented in SFWorks' second cycle of training, which started in the fall of 1998. For most of these training programs, SFWorks actively brokered relationships between businesses and training organizations. The result was a set of industry- or company-specific trainings with direct connections to specific jobs in areas like banking, legal services, clerical/insurance, and health care. This second cycle of training faced a number of unique obstacles. A custodial training program was discontinued when the placement relationship that SFWorks was brokering between the union hiring hall and employers did not materialize. (As a result, SFWorks had to step in to handle all job placements.) In addition, the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center, one of SFWorks' key employer partners, underwent a hiring freeze. The second cycle of training placed 60 of 115 enrollees in jobs. Although this overall placement rate was about equal to that of the pilot phase, retention figures for the second cycle of training exceeded those of the pilot. In addition, certain second-cycle training programs—such as the Legal Employment Action Program, which placed 12 of 23 enrollees (and 86 percent of program graduates) in full-time jobs—emerged as potential models for replication.

In May 1999, SFWorks began its third cycle of training and placement, which continued the basic program design developed for the second cycle and graduated more than 54 participants over four different training programs. At the same time, SFWorks has been working to address some of its persistent challenges—programs operating below full capacity, the need to increase overall program capacity, the need for more efficient data collection and tracking systems—and trying to establish a long-term strategy for the program. SFWorks intends to build program impact by creating training in new sectors (technology and telecommunications), expanding its target population to include General Assistance recipients in San Francisco, and providing technical assistance to welfare-to-work programs in other parts of the Bay Area.

SFWorks has also taken strides to work even more closely with public agencies (especially the San Francisco Department of Human Services) and to situate its work within broader workforce development efforts in San Francisco. The Department of Human Services will be providing direct funding for the next (that is, fourth) cycle of SFWorks training programs, a fact that positions SFWorks as a viable incubator of new job training programs. In addition, SFWorks now offers career advancement services that are available to low-skill, low-wage workers.

SFWorks' job training efforts merit attention because they illustrate broader lessons and themes concerning workforce development and business sector-led welfare-to-work programs. These are discussed in the following section.

KEY LESSONS

The evidence from SFWorks' first few years strongly suggests that there is substantial potential for closer business involvement in programs intended to move welfare recipients (and other low-income persons) into work. A number of lessons emerged from the SFWorks case study that, if adopted, might help public and private sector initiatives to more fully realize this potential and increase the impact of these efforts on the business community, the public employment and training systems, and the low-income population.

- **Private sector-led intermediaries that focus on employment of welfare recipients can be successful in engaging a variety of employers and private sector resources and in placing welfare recipients in employment.**

  Discussion: The experience of SFWorks shows that the private sector can be a leader in developing programs that successfully place welfare recipients in jobs that meet employers' labor force needs. Although the size and scale of private sector-led initiatives such as SFWorks may not reach that of employment programs provided through public agencies (which have far greater resources), private sector initiatives can complement and influence public sector activities and more directly engage the broader employer community.

- **Private sector intermediaries can build relationships with employers by framing welfare-to-work efforts in business terms (such as the potentially high return on investment [ROI] of business involvement in workforce development) and can leverage these key relationships by gaining access to employer groups and private sector resources.**

  Discussion: SFWorks has created a sound model for attracting and working with business partners. SFWorks appeals to business partners by stressing bottom-line benefits like reduced recruitment and hiring costs, reduced employee turnover and increased employee productivity,[1] custom-trained applicants, tax credits, and so on. In addition, SFWorks' success in obtaining business partnerships has afforded the organization various opportunities to leverage these relationships and the resources that businesses bring to the program. For example, SFWorks utilized its relationship with Aon Risk Services to reach out to the

1. In a satisfaction survey of SFWorks business partners (published in October 1999 by Berkeley-based BTW Consultants), 80 percent of SFWorks business partners reported that SFWorks graduates were either as productive as or more productive than other entry-level employees. In addition, 93 percent of SFWorks business partners said they would refer another business to SFWorks.

insurance industry at large. Similarly, a partnership with the Bar Association of San Francisco has given SFWorks access to more than 40 law firms. At the same time, SFWorks' partnerships with businesses gave the program access to a wide range of resources: on-site training, equipment, facilities, and funds for underwriting paid internships.

- **There is a crucial distinction between "business-backed" and "employer-led" initiatives. *Business-backed initiatives* rely on the private sector for few commitments beyond financial backing; *employer-led initiatives* engage employers in all facets of employment training by seeking active participation and buy-in at various levels of companies' organizational structures and by identifying advocates for the program *within* the businesses.**

  Discussion: In redesigning its program approach after the pilot phase of training, SFWorks moved from being primarily business-backed (with general business support and resources made available) to being employer-led (with specific employers or groups of employers playing a role in shaping the curriculum to meet their specific labor force needs). The latter approach—often called the "sectoral approach" when it involves a cluster of employers in the same industry—appeared to have greater success in helping individuals find and hold full-time jobs. Further, the employer-led approach required a greater level of participation at both higher and lower levels in the employers' hierarchy, so that individuals closer to specific labor force needs became involved in the program and, in turn, became program advocates *inside* the business.

- **Private sector welfare-to-work intermediaries can become an important route for identifying strengths and weaknesses in existing systems and service providers. Private sector intermediaries can also be an influential force in improving the system and increasing its capacity to serve disadvantaged populations well.**

  Discussion: The enrollment, completion, placement, and retention data from SFWorks show that different service providers encountered different types of problems in moving a more disadvantaged welfare recipient population to work. As a result, the SFWorks program helped highlight the strengths and weaknesses of training providers. SFWorks also has been instrumental in identifying the difficulties in using state Employment Training Panel (ETP) funds for welfare training programs and has made employer-backed proposals to change the program so that it is more suitable for welfare-to-work efforts.

As the experience of SFWorks suggests, private sector initiatives can help to increase the potential and capacity of existing state and local systems by clarifying business goals and

service expectations for service providers, providing regular feedback on the providers' accomplishments and deficits, and becoming an advocate for change when rules or regulations present barriers to smooth program operation. At the same time, SFWorks' experience shows that private sector intermediaries should avoid becoming training agencies or program operators in order to maintain their overall influence, which could be reduced if such intermediaries become service providers themselves. Rather, these private sector intermediaries may best play a "brokering" role between the employer community and training agencies, cultivating relationships with employers and securing their commitment to working with training organizations, utilizing employers' expertise in developing training curricula, developing clear agreements with training organizations, and serving as unbiased proponents for change when needed.

- **Paid internships and mentoring are two potentially powerful motivating factors for welfare-to-work program participants.**

  Discussion: Employers and others who had contact with SFWorks participants often highlighted the paid internship portion of the training and individual mentoring as keys to participants' success. The internship stage of training allows welfare-to-work participants to gain confidence, explore a new vocational culture, and place their hard-skills training in a real-world professional context. In addition, many of the businesses that partnered with SFWorks matched employee volunteer mentors with SFWorks participants as they went through the paid work experience and, later, got placed in full-time positions. Participants, employers, and SFWorks staff universally noted that mentors give SFWorks participants an approachable point of contact for asking questions, resolving conflicts, and airing concerns.

COMMUNITY CONTEXT

The Bay Area Economy

San Francisco sits at the center of a rapidly growing metropolitan area that encompasses nine counties and more than 6 million residents. Although no longer the largest city in the Bay Area (San Jose has a larger population), San Francisco remains the primary urban center in a thriving regional economy whose main industries include financial services, technology, retail trade, services (including tourism), and manufacturing. After weathering a recession during the early

1990s, San Francisco and the Bay Area are now in the midst of a major economic boom led by intense growth in the technology industry. Silicon Valley, roughly an hour's drive south of San Francisco, is the most concentrated (and best-known) area of high-tech activity, but many parts of San Francisco—especially the area south of Market Street—have emerged as key players in the Internet age.

At the same time that SFWorks was taking shape in late 1997, the Bay Area was in its fourth consecutive year of economic growth following the 1990-1993 recession. This steady economic growth had cut across virtually all sectors and caused a broad increase in labor market demand. The Bay Area unemployment rate in 1997 dropped to 3.2 percent—half the statewide rate of 6 percent and well below the national unemployment rate of almost 5 percent. (The Bay Area's unemployment rate decreased slightly to 3.1 percent in 1998.) This impressive job growth (which is expected to continue, if at a slower pace) and low unemployment mean, in part, that employers must look for new ways to meet the demand for qualified workers.

Welfare-to-Work in San Francisco

At the center of San Francisco's welfare-to-work efforts is San Francisco's Department of Human Services (DHS). DHS is responsible for implementing CalWORKs—the name for California's version of welfare reform—in the City and County of San Francisco. DHS calculates and administers cash grants and provides case management services, vocational training, child care, transportation, mental health and substance abuse services, family support, domestic violence counseling, and employment retention services.

Local public sector welfare-to-work efforts are supplemented—and in many cases funded—by government programs at the state and federal levels. State agencies involved in welfare-to-work include the California Employment Development Department and the California Department of Rehabilitation. The Private Industry Council of San Francisco collaborates with DHS to administer funds provided through the U.S. Department of Labor's Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and through the Department of Labor's welfare-to-work funds, which target welfare recipients who have multiple barriers to employment. Additionally, San Francisco's large and diverse nonprofit sector includes hundreds of community-based organizations involved in some facet of welfare-to-work. San Francisco also is home to the Small Business Network's Placement Partnership Initiative, an effort by the city's smaller employers to provide work readiness and intensive post-employment services to CalWORKs participants.

The sheer number and variety of welfare-to-work programs in San Francisco have at least two major implications for job training providers. First, with numerous training organizations vying for a finite (and decreasing) number of CalWORKs participants, most welfare-to-work programs struggle to operate at full capacity. Second, any single provider or program must carefully consider how its program works in relation to (and, where appropriate, in connection with) the many *other* service providers.

CREATING SFWORKS

Impetus for Business Backing

In 1996, shortly after the passage of the federal welfare reform legislation, San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown asked the San Francisco business community to take a leadership role in welfare reform. Specifically, Mayor Brown wanted the city's businesses to consider hiring from the city's caseload of welfare families, which stood at 12,000 as of September 1996.

The mayor's challenge was directed in part to the influential business leaders on the Committee on Jobs (COJ), a group of 35 of San Francisco's largest companies. In a presentation to the COJ Board, Mayor Brown painted a bleak portrait of welfare reform's potential impact on the City of San Francisco. Brown described a worst-case scenario in which the TANF time limits might drain $74 million from the city's annual budget because of an increased demand for social services. With Brown calling for the active involvement of the city's largest employers, Douglas Shorenstein, Chairman and CEO of Shorenstein Company and then-Chairman of the COJ Board, commissioned Mark Mosher, COJ Executive Director, to develop a variety of proposals for how the business community could get involved with welfare-to-work efforts.

Early Research and Planning

Mosher realized that rallying support from San Francisco's large employers would require a program that directly spoke to the business community. Mosher's thinking on the COJ's welfare reform initiative was deeply influenced by the New Hope Project, a Milwaukee, Wisconsin, welfare-to-work initiative that had been embraced by businesses because of a purely economic argument that (1) illustrated how welfare has traditionally paid more than low-wage jobs and (2) portrayed welfare recipients as motivated by bottom-line, cost-benefit analyses.

After a few months of research, which included observing various welfare-to-work initiatives around the country, Mosher brought together an alliance of business leaders (including representatives from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce), activists, and management consultants (the latter, to craft a strategy for obtaining the business community's support). Mosher secured *pro bono* assistance from Andersen Consulting to produce a multifaceted study that examined the types of entry-level jobs suitable for welfare recipients with limited work histories, the range of workforce development training available in San Francisco, and the financial impact of moving off welfare. Andersen's findings described the economic disincentives of moving off welfare and asserted that many existing job programs did not prepare participants for real job market needs. As part of its recommendations, Andersen suggested introducing market forces into the employment training arena, especially with regard to funding training organizations based on their demonstrated costs and outcomes. In March 1997, Mosher presented the Andersen study to the COJ Board, which rallied behind the idea of creating a sustainable workforce development system designed both to meet the actual needs of San Francisco's labor market and to make entry-level work more financially attractive than welfare.

Following this pivotal COJ Board meeting, Mosher began developing the details of program design and creating a capital endowment for the COJ's welfare-to-work initiative. Mosher met regularly with a core group of CEOs from seven of the city's largest businesses. In addition to agreeing to hire welfare recipients (to the extent possible), this group committed itself to raise $3.7 million for the effort (over a three-year period) and made initial contributions totaling $600,000.[2] While Mosher was working to raise funds for the initiative, Roberta Achtenberg, Senior Vice President for Policy at the Chamber of Commerce, focused on generating a broad base of support among the business community and establishing relationships with key national foundations and welfare-to-work evaluators. As a former senior-level official in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and a former member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Achtenberg understood federal policy objectives as well as local political dynamics.

The new initiative, called San Francisco Works (or SFWorks), ultimately took shape as a collaboration among three founding members: the Committee on Jobs, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and the United Way of the Bay Area, which had initially been investigating the creation of its own regional welfare-to-work initiative. The Board of Directors, comprising approximately five designees from each founding member, would meet quarterly. The United Way, with

2. By the end of SFWorks' second fiscal year (June 30, 1999), businesses had contributed a total of just over $1.1 million.

its tax-exempt status, would serve as fiscal agent and provide the new organization with an infrastructure of accounting and human resources. SFWorks would have its own skeletal staff, whose senior member would report weekly to the Management Committee, composed of one representative from each founding member.[3] Achtenberg assumed daily oversight responsibility for the organization, which would be housed in the Chamber's offices. In addition to the business backing already mentioned, SFWorks was created with large grants from The Rockefeller Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the F.B. Heron Foundation, and the James Irvine Foundation.

Each of the three founding members took on responsibilities appropriate to its expertise and constituency. The Chamber of Commerce would work with its 2,200 members to create new job opportunities for SFWorks participants. The Committee on Jobs would leverage the financial strength of its members to raise funds, build the necessary business alliances, and recruit large businesses interested in establishing in-house training programs. Mosher would continue to play a central role in creating SFWorks' organizational structure and program design. The United Way, with its close ties to San Francisco community-based organizations (CBOs), would sponsor bidders conferences where CBOs would learn about prospects for participating in SFWorks. In addition, the United Way, which had moved to an outcomes-based model of grant-making earlier in the 1990s, would provide guidance as SFWorks developed its performance-based model of payment to training organizations.

Fine-Tuning the Program Design

In late spring 1997, Mosher produced an initial sketch of the SFWorks program design. The key objectives described in the plan included pilot-testing in-house welfare-to-work programs at San Francisco businesses that would hire a total of 300 welfare recipients, creating a job training program for 1,000 welfare recipients through contracts with three CBOs that would be selected through a competitive bidding process, and collaborating with Goodwill San Francisco to establish a nonprofit temporary employment agency for 300 former TANF recipients. Mosher's plan also called for SFWorks to lobby for a state Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC),[4] to assist small

3. The Management Committee was made up of Mosher, Achtenberg, and Sheila Hill-Fajors, President of the United Way of the Bay Area.

4. The EITC is a refundable federal tax credit for low-income workers. Since the credit is "refundable," workers can claim it even if they owe no tax. The EITC is intended as an incentive to work and is designed to change the income calculus of low-income work. SFWorks' idea to help businesses assist their employees to apply for EITC was a response to the fact that many people who are eligible for the EITC don't take advantage of it.

businesses to help their employees apply for the federal EITC, and to encourage the City of San Francisco to earmark 200 jobs for welfare recipients on bond-financed public works projects. As conceived of in this initial framework, SFWorks would respond directly to the findings of the Andersen study by (1) providing job training designed to meet specific job market needs and (2) removing the potential financial disincentives of moving into paid employment by opening up access to higher-paying jobs.

The initial program sketch of SFWorks was harshly criticized in the local media, which pointed to the fact that the initiative called on SFWorks partner businesses—which included the city's largest employers—to hire a total of just 300 welfare recipients. In response to this negative publicity, a political/public relations consulting firm worked with SFWorks to create a new slogan for the initiative—"2,000 by 2000"—which committed SFWorks to transitioning 2,000 welfare recipients into paid employment by the year 2000. Whatever its merits in terms of publicity, this catchy slogan ultimately had the effect of making SFWorks accountable for a goal that proved quite unrealistic.

In August 1997, Mosher hired Richard Schwartz of Opportunity America, a consulting firm working with welfare-to-work programs throughout the country, to move the SFWorks program design forward. Schwartz, who had been a key welfare reform adviser to Mayor Rudolph Giuliani of New York City, subcontracted with Jason Turner, who had been involved in designing Wisconsin's well-known welfare-to-work program. Schwartz and Turner were brought on to develop an operations plan that would detail how SFWorks could mobilize the business community to move 2,000 welfare recipients into paid employment. The plan—although skeletal on some operational matters—extensively outlined the politics of a business-backed welfare-to-work program in San Francisco, described the components of effective welfare-to-work systems, and identified some of the challenges SFWorks faced in maintaining a sufficient flow of participants. Relatedly, the operating plan stressed the importance of creating a viable process of receiving referrals from the San Francisco Department of Human Services, an objective that would prove a persistent challenge for SFWorks.

Staffing SFWorks

In September 1997, the SFWorks Board of Directors chose Heather Hiles as the first executive director of the organization. Hiles came to SFWorks after three years with a financial services consulting firm. Her background included extensive experience in employment training, non-

profit management, small business management, and political campaigns. The Board of Directors also selected Kasey Brenner as a programmatic staff person reporting to Hiles. Brenner had administered the city's "Express-to-Success" program, a seven-day job-readiness program for welfare recipients. Brenner knew the city's welfare system firsthand and was familiar with most of the players in the nonprofit workforce development field as well as with the selection processes used by government funding programs. Hiles hired her longtime colleague Rachel Jordan, an architect, to serve as operations and office manager. One of the first steps taken by Hiles was changing the titles of each position to accord with those used in the business sector. Hiles took the title of President and CEO, Brenner was named Vice President of Employment Training, and Jordan was named Executive Assistant.

THE SFWORKS PILOT PHASE

Hiles and her staff decided to follow a very tight time frame for launching the program. With support of the SFWorks Board of the Directors, Hiles and her staff pushed ahead with developing a pilot phase that would quickly make SFWorks operational and would then allow the organization to test its program design and make the necessary changes before beginning a larger, second phase of the program. The Request for Qualifications, which would identify CBOs to provide training for the pilot SFWorks class, was set to be sent out in November, only several weeks after Hiles officially joined SFWorks.

The pilot-phase program design positioned SFWorks as a funding source for a variety of welfare-to-work training programs. The basic premise was that SFWorks would foster more successful programs by (1) investing in hard-skills training, a departure from the work-first approach favored by SFWorks' peer programs; (2) helping to create linkages with the business community; and (3) creating contracts that compensated the training organizations based on performance.

This pilot phase of SFWorks consisted of six components:

1. CBO selection. A rigorous selection process would identify five CBOs to provide training and case management for 25 TANF recipients each.

2. Curriculum development. SFWorks staff would work with CBOs to create training curricula.

3. Appraisal class. The CBOs would oversee a seven-day assessment period to screen participants for motivation and potential for job-readiness.[5]

4. Classroom training course and paid work experience (PWE). A three-month, half-day training class taught by the CBOs would provide participants with hard-skills and soft-skills training.[6] At the same time, participants would take part in three-month, half-day internships that would give them supervised employment experience and the chance to test skills learned in the classroom. Participants would be paid wages for this internship in amounts that would supplement their TANF grants.[7]

5. Job placement. On completion of the three-month paid work experience and training class, participants would be placed in full-time private sector jobs.

6. Job retention. Participants would receive job retention services (that is, ongoing support and follow-up) for nine months after placement.

A total of 41 CBOs responded to the SFWorks Request for Qualifications, and SFWorks conducted three-hour site visits at the 25 agencies it deemed capable of meeting the basic program objectives. Based on a variety of criteria (including proposed program design, track record in serving a welfare population, relationships with employers, neighborhood diversity/geographic location, and the ability to bring a program to scale), SFWorks selected the following five organizations as the training providers for its pilot phase:

- **Career Resources Development Center (CRDC)** was selected to administer a training program in clerical internships. Located in a predominantly low-income neighborhood in San Francisco, CRDC impressed SFWorks with its 30 years of experience working with the neighborhood's large immigrant and welfare populations.
- **Jewish Vocational Service (JVS)** was selected to administer a training program for clinical assistants in conjunction with the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center. JVS is widely regarded as one of San Francisco's leading job training organizations and has a particular expertise in working with immigrant and disabled populations.

---

5. Individuals who, in the course of appraisal, were deemed ready for work without additional training could be referred for immediate placement by SFWorks or the CBO. Individuals not accepted into SFWorks could be referred to DHS for assessment and job training.

6. Job training is often divided into the general categories of hard skills and soft skills. *Hard skills* include such things as business English, general computer literacy, word processing, database management, and job-specific technical skills. *Soft skills* include such areas as interpersonal communication, workplace etiquette, and teamwork.

7. Although payment of wages does impact the size of TANF grants, CalWORKs calculates grants with an income disregard so that working TANF participants have a higher income than they would through TANF payments alone.

- **Mission Language and Vocational Services (MLVS), Inc.,** was selected to administer a training program specializing in clerical internships. MLVS is a long-standing organization based in the Mission neighborhood and possesses expertise in serving Spanish-speaking populations. Despite MLVS's past financial difficulties, SFWorks believed that this organization would thrive if provided with an infusion of capital.
- **Renaissance Parents of Success (RPOS)** was selected to administer a training program specializing in United Airlines-affiliated positions, such as customer service representatives. Although RPOS had never operated an employment training program, SFWorks valued its track record of placing neighborhood residents in jobs as well as its strong community ties to Bayview Hunters Point, a predominantly African-American neighborhood with a high percentage of welfare recipients.
- **Youth Assistance Association of San Francisco (YAA)** was selected to administer automotive internships in conjunction with an automotive repair training class at City College of San Francisco. SFWorks was impressed with YAA's proposed partnership with City College and Grand Auto, and with the fact that YAA guaranteed SFWorks participants an entry-level wage of $11.90 per hour.

The contract with the pilot-phase CBOs called for SFWorks to make two initial payments to the organizations. The first payment, a start-up grant made *before* the appraisal period, enabled CBOs to hire curriculum consultants and purchase equipment, such as computer hardware and software. The second payment was a lump sum paid upon SFWorks' first receipt of deliverables from the CBOs' appraisal classes (that is, attendance sheets, completed job-readiness checklists, etc.). Compensation for CBOs *after* the appraisal stage was structured as shown in Table 1.

Capacity-Building for CBOs

SFWorks had emphasized capacity-building for CBOs from its earliest program design stages. The Rockefeller Foundation, one of SFWorks' major early funders, was interested in helping CBOs meet the job training challenges posed by welfare reform. As it turned out, CBOs themselves had also seized on the capacity-building potential that SFWorks offered. Although early plans for SFWorks had proposed contracting with different CBOs for each stage of the job training process (job training, placement, retention, etc.), input from CBOs during the planning and Request for Qualifications process—and the CBOs' proposals themselves—persuaded SFWorks

to contract with CBOs for the entire spectrum of services. SFWorks expected that grants and technical assistance would help CBOs strengthen the areas in which they had less experience or expertise.

SFWorks' intended focus on CBO capacity-building was a major factor in how the partner CBOs were selected for the pilot phase. Not all of the five organizations were deemed the most capable. Instead, SFWorks selected programs that (1) had unique abilities in the area of training, placement, or recruiting; (2) met most of the selection criteria; and (3) seemed most capable of achieving increased capacity (in terms of program quality and scale and the ability to serve the welfare population) with technical assistance or small infusions of capital.

Table 1 **San Francisco Works: Performance-Based Payment**[a]

Performance Measure	Percentage Paid
Enrollment	15
Mid-completion of classroom training and paid work experience	15
Completion of classroom training and paid work experience	15
Full-time job placement	20
Four-month job retention[b]	25
Seven-month job retention[b]	10
Total	**100**

SOURCE: San Francisco Works.

NOTES:

[a]Paid to training organizations on a per participant basis.

[b]The four-month and seven-month time frames in this performance-based model were based on a time line used by the state Employment Training Panel (ETP). SFWorks' contract with ETP is described below.

ETP Funds

During its early stages of development, SFWorks had highlighted its intended independence from public funding. With business backing, the argument went, SFWorks would have greater flexibility than programs beholden to the requirements of government contracts. Nonetheless, SFWorks decided to apply for funds from the Employment Training Panel (ETP), a division of California's Employment Development Department. Financed by a percentage of employers' contributions to the California unemployment insurance fund, ETP funds totaled $83 million in FY 1998, with $20 million being designated by the state legislature for welfare-to-work programs. The general ETP program is designed to fund training for individuals who are already working at least 20 hours a week.

SFWorks' decision to apply for ETP funds was based on two major factors. First, ETP funds would give SFWorks enough capital to pay wages to program participants during the paid work experience stage of the training. Second, ETP's policy of funding training that was concurrent

with employment fit SFWorks' own program model, which called for training and the paid work experience to begin at the same time. In early 1998, as the pilot phase was about to begin, SFWorks learned that it would receive an ETP grant of $3.2 million, enough to pay wages of $5.75 per hour to 643 TANF recipients during a two-year period. A Sacramento-based company called LETC would receive $700,000 (out of SFWorks' $3.2 million grant) to administer the ETP grant. ETP pays providers according to the schedule shown in Table 2.

Table 2 **Employment Training Panel: Performance-Based Payment**[a]

Performance Measure	Percentage Paid
Partial completion (20%) of classroom hours	25
Completion of classroom hours	50
90-day job retention (within a 120-day period)	25
Total	**100**

NOTE: [a]Paid to training organizations on a per participant basis.

There are many respects in which ETP payments to providers differ from the payments of SFWorks, but two distinctions are especially important. First, ETP funding is an all-or-nothing proposition. The first two payments noted in Table 2 (the payments of 25 percent and 50 percent) are *advances* on the entire per participant payment and must be returned to ETP if the trainee does not achieve placement and 90 days' retention. Second, ETP does not pay for any training that takes place before placement.[8] As a result of these differences, SFWorks had to maintain an adequate level of non-ETP funds to pay for deliverables and activities that ultimately were not covered by ETP funds.

Relationships with Public Agencies

The ETP contract notwithstanding, SFWorks in its early phases (that is, in preparing for the pilot) saw itself as distinct from the major public workforce development systems. SFWorks obtained buy-in from businesses in part by positioning itself as a more efficient alternative to existing training programs, including those in the public sector. In fact, SFWorks launched its pilot phase about a month *before* DHS initiated its CalWORKs implementation plan on April 6, 1998.[9] With participants entering the SFWorks program before going through the formal CalWORKs enrollment process, DHS had to shoulder the logistical and administrative burden

8. This particular difference was not a great issue during the pilot phase, because in these initial trainings the internships and the classroom training began at the same time. However, there was a greater difference between SFWorks' and ETP's payment methods in the post-pilot trainings, where classroom training began before the internships.

9. As part of the CalWORKs program, each county in California developed a state-approved plan for how it would implement the provisions of CalWORKs.

of back-registering SFWorks participants. DHS accomplished this by meeting with SFWorks participants on site at the five CBOs that took part in the pilot phase. This back-registration process worked well from the standpoint of ensuring that SFWorks participants received supportive services (child care, transportation, etc.). Still, SFWorks' pre-CalWORKs start-up date meant that many participants in SFWorks' pilot phase had self-referred—that is, had entered the program without the type of vocational assessment provided by DHS's employment specialists.

SFWorks at the outset did not pursue a close relationship with the Private Industry Council of San Francisco (PICSF), a nonprofit organization created under the federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982.[10] PICSF administers grants (of federal funds) to training organizations that it selects through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Business representatives on the PIC provide a link between job training programs and the business community in part by setting policies for how job market needs should be factored into the RFP process, and so it appeared that SFWorks was potentially replicating PICSF's work. However, SFWorks saw its unique role as (1) more directly engaging the business community in job training programs and (2) investing in employer-based hard-skills training programs.

The Pilot Phase: Major Setbacks, Clear Lessons

Recruitment, Orientation, Appraisal

SFWorks arranged for the San Francisco Public Housing Authority to send letters to 2,500 households in targeted zip codes in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood (an area with the highest concentration of TANF recipients in San Francisco) and posted flyers in selected public housing developments. SFWorks also received some referrals from welfare caseworkers who were familiar with the program and from individual contact between Kasey Brenner, the Vice President of Employment Training, and welfare recipients whom she knew from her previous work at DHS.

10. JTPA funds are federal funds that are funneled through the states and managed at the local level by a partnership between a city or county and a Private Industry Council (PIC), composed of representatives from private sector businesses, educational agencies, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, CBOs, and others. As of July 2000, JTPA will be superseded by the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, although the basic delivery system will remain in place.

Referrals from DHS overall were limited for the pilot phase, inasmuch as SFWorks got under way before the start of DHS's CalWORKs implementation plan.

SFWorks' four orientation sessions in early March 1998 were attended by a total of 253 potential participants. The orientations outlined the five CBOs' training programs (including the expected salaries of the different job tracks) and explained that SFWorks participants would be eligible for child care subsidies, free public transportation passes, and transitional health care benefits. (Orientation attendees who wanted more information about obtaining these benefits were able to meet privately with staff from San Francisco's Department of Human Services.)

SFWorks officially launched its pilot in mid-March with the beginning of the seven-day appraisal phase, intended to screen participants for motivation and eligibility only. The appraisal period also strived to make participants confident that they could succeed through SFWorks and to create strong bonds among participants *and* between participants and the CBO trainers. Of the 180 individuals who had signed up at orientation, 120 started the appraisal period.

In its original design for the pilot phase, SFWorks had expected that CBOs would propose curricula for both the appraisal and the training/internship stages and that SFWorks, in turn, would help standardize these plans. In fact, SFWorks ultimately provided CBOs with a motivational lifeskills curriculum for the appraisal, although it was expected that each CBO would customize the curriculum to meet its specific needs. Only one CBO substantially modified this appraisal curriculum, however, and all the CBOs later noted that the motivational lifeskills approach was inappropriate and even superfluous in light of the enthusiasm of the pilot participants. CBOs, however, did appreciate the input and creativity of the professional curriculum consultants whom SFWorks made available during the appraisal class.

SFWorks held a debriefing session for CBOs about two weeks after the orientation and appraisal period ended. The CBOs generally were uniform in their constructive criticism of this stage of the pilot. They suggested that SFWorks provide child care at the orientations, ensure sufficient time between orientation and appraisal, ascertain that staff on site at the orientations can provide information for individuals who are not TANF recipients or otherwise cannot participate in SFWorks,[11] and create an equitable system for how participants are assigned their priority choices of training programs.

---

11. For instance, an individual might not have adequate English skills to participate in SFWorks, or might be unable to arrange a personal schedule to accommodate the program.

Pilot-Phase Training Programs

Upon completing the appraisal class, eligible participants enrolled in one of the five on-the-job training internships and the corresponding classroom training class. Of the 120 individuals who had started the appraisal class, 99 were enrolled in the three-month internship/classroom training. (Four of the appraisal participants were dismissed; others either left voluntarily or could not fit SFWorks into their schedules.)

In the pilot phase (as well as in subsequent cycles of training), SFWorks ran training programs that were small and rather expensive, but this was by design. Partly because it focused on training a hard-to-serve population, SFWorks opted to offer an intensive level of training, even if it meant training and placing fewer participants. According to SFWorks, the average program participant has been on welfare for 60 months and has a fifth-grade reading level and fourth-grade math level.

SFWorks relied on the pilot-phase CBOs to develop their own unique curricula for the three-month training programs. Most of the CBOs produced curricula that were not very successful, partly because of the lack of employer involvement in the curriculum development process and partly because of the short time frame—approximately four weeks—in which the CBOs had to develop the curricula. Another factor was the varying levels of expertise among the five CBOs, some of which had never before developed a three-month curriculum. SFWorks had been told—incorrectly, as it turned out—that most CBOs already possessed a curriculum that could easily be tailored for this program.

The internship—or paid work experience (PWE)—ran concurrently with the classroom training course and required participants to work four hours a day for three consecutive months at a work site. During this period, CBOs also were required to provide what SFWorks called "Early Retention Services." CBO staff members would provide each participant with individualized, structured on-site training in specific job-related skills, as required by SFWorks' contract with ETP. Additionally, CBOs would provide each participant with a mentor, preferably an employee in a field relevant to the training.

Training and Placement of the Pilot Class

SFWorks had approached the pilot phase as a true pilot—that is, as an opportunity to test a certain program design that would later be restructured based on lessons learned during this initial phase. As it turned out, it was not very long into the pilot phase before SFWorks staff realized some of the pilot's key shortcomings. These included:

- **The lack of meaningful connections between CBOs and employers.** SFWorks had created the pilot phase with the expectation that the partner CBOs would arrange paid work experience opportunities at employer sites. Jewish Vocational Service and the Youth Assistance Association were the only CBOs that delivered on this commitment. (For a closer look at the partnership between Jewish Vocational Service and the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center, see the box below.) In the case of the other three training organizations, the relationships with employers never materialized, so SFWorks found itself having to arrange for paid work experience placements during the appraisal phase of the pilot. Also, despite the Youth Assistance Association's ability to place individuals in internships at Grand Auto, this organization's hard-skills training (offered through City

An Employer Partnership with Results: Jewish Vocational Service and the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center

In preparing the Jewish Vocational Service (JVS) response to the SFWorks Request for Qualifications seeking CBOs to provide training, Abby Snay, Executive Director of JVS, contacted the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center to see whether it had a workforce need. She was told that there was a demand for clinic assistants, an entry-level position that involves checking-in patients, pulling charts, and working on the frontlines in UCSF's ambulatory care clinic.

After being selected for the pilot phase, JVS was well positioned to provide comprehensive services that included everything from recruitment to retention. JVS worked with UCSF to design a hard-skills curriculum specifically tailored to the clinic assistant position. JVS handled appraisal, soft-skills training, and retention and also hired contract staff to conduct the hard-skills instruction.

JVS's ability to secure an employer partner had a significant impact on all facets of its pilot-phase program. For instance, JVS engaged the medical center in the appraisal stage of the program. JVS rented a bus to take the group of 45 program candidates to the medical center for a tour and a series of group interviews (these were extremely popular components with the participants). The medical center provided JVS with classrooms, clinical space, and computers for the training and established a mentoring program for the trainees.

A total of 15 individuals enrolled in the JVS/UCSF training during the pilot; 11 completed the internship/classroom training, and 9 individuals were placed in clinical assistant jobs at UCSF.

College of San Francisco) was reported to not closely match the type of work that participants ultimately did at Grand Auto. It was also reported that at many of the pilot phase's training sites, the quality of training ultimately didn't live up to what was promised in the initial proposals.

- **Lack of a good fit between many pilot participants and paid internships.** SFWorks' pilot phase was designed to place participants in internship settings immediately following the appraisal period. However, two factors made this approach generally unsuccessful during the pilot phase. First, many pilot participants simply did not have the basic skills they needed to be placed in an internship setting. Second, the quality of many of the internships arranged by the CBOs was not very high. Thus, many of the internships were not appropriate matches for the SFWorks participants. The pilot-phase experience ultimately made SFWorks question the approach of placing participants in structured positions *before* they could receive some degree of training.

During the latter stages of the pilot training, there was a change in the position of Vice President of Employment Training. Kasey Brenner left the organization and was replaced by Caz Pereira, who had previously worked in the Contract Education Department at City College of San Francisco, where he had been the college's point-person for a welfare-to-work program run by Pacific Gas & Electric, a large regional utility company. When Pereira joined SFWorks in May 1998, his first order of business was ensuring that as many participants as possible met the basic requirements for SFWorks graduation.

The program design of the pilot phase did not *require* paid work experiences that would lead directly into permanent employment when participants graduated from the program. Even so, SFWorks had expected that CBOs that had contracted to provide placement services would have employers ready to place training graduates in full-time positions. There were instances where relationships with employers did in fact materialize as the pilot progressed. For example, a City College instructor leading the hard-skills component of YAA's automotive training program worked with Grand Auto and placed 12 people in internships; 4 of these were later hired full time by Grand Auto. Despite a few such successes, SFWorks had to take a major job development and placement role at the end of the pilot-phase training. According to CEO Hiles, SFWorks had to "pound the pavement" in order to find job placements for graduates of the training program.

SFWorks expended a considerable amount of time contacting employers and identifying potential placements, and a majority of the individuals who graduated from the pilot class ultimately were placed in paid employment. Table 3 shows the outcomes of pilot-phase training and placement, broken down by training organization.

Capacity-Building for CBOs

Although explicitly stated as one of the initial goals of SFWorks, capacity-building for CBOs did not emerge as one of the strengths of the pilot phase. SFWorks' original thinking had been that by holding CBOs accountable for performance and providing them with funds and technical assis-

Table 3 San Francisco Works: Outcomes from Pilot-Phase Training Programs

Training Organization (CBO)	Program Capacity	Enrollees/ Terminees	Completed Training	Placed in Job	Placement Rate	9-Month Retention	Unit Cost (Through Placement)
Career Resources Development Center	25	23	11	10	43%	5[a]	$6,576
Jewish Vocational Service/ UCSF	15	15	11	9	60%	5[a]	$6,431
Mission Language and Vocational Services	25	25	16	14	56%	3[a]	$6,228
Renaissance Parents of Success	25	22	15	14	64%	7[a]	$5,626
Youth Assistance Association of San Francisco	15	14	8	4	29%	3[a]	n/a[b]
Total	**105**	**99**	**61**	**51**	**52%[c]**	**23**	**n/a[b]**

SOURCE: San Francisco Works.

NOTES:

[a]Denotes estimate.

[b]The YAA contract was discontinued, so cost per placement figures for this program—and total cost per placement figures for the pilot—are not available.

[c]The total number of people placed in jobs divided by the total number of enrollees/terminees.

tance, SFWorks would help build strong training programs. Several factors, however, precluded SFWorks from fulfilling this goal.

First, the incredibly tight time frame in which the pilot phase took shape made it difficult for the technical assistance components to unfold properly. For instance, SFWorks prescribed a standardized appraisal curriculum just weeks before the appraisal stage was set to begin, which meant that the training organizations had little time to revise the appraisal curriculum to reflect their specific needs.

Second, the administrative rigors of SFWorks' performance-based payment system proved extremely burdensome to most of the pilot-phase CBOs. SFWorks' reporting requirements exceeded what most nonprofit organizations can fulfill. An organization like Jewish Vocational Service, which receives more than half its funds through government contracts, had the information management infrastructure needed to produce the required information, but this is not the case at most nonprofit training organizations. Furthermore, while the reporting requirements placed an administrative burden on the CBOs, the incentives for reporting were not well managed. According to BTW Consultants—an outside consulting firm that has assisted SFWorks with planning and evaluation—payment alone typically is not enough of an incentive to ensure efficient reporting. The best incentive for getting quality information from CBOs, BTW noted, is to gather information that is intrinsically valuable and accessible to the CBOs themselves. This was not the focus of SFWorks' information-reporting requirements during the pilot phase.

Third—and perhaps most important—SFWorks has operated with a very small staff. With just five employees, SFWorks must administer training program contracts; track all program statistics; undertake aggressive, ongoing business development activities; provide support and technical assistance to training providers; and work to secure funding from businesses, foundations, and public agencies. This leaves little time and resources to pursue capacity-building in the manner envisioned during SFWorks' planning stages.

Nonetheless, SFWorks did score some capacity-building successes during its pilot phase. The CBOs received start-up cash payments from SFWorks that allowed them to purchase much-needed training equipment. The CBOs also expressed their satisfaction with consultants—funded by SFWorks—who helped develop training curricula. In addition, the centralized recruitment managed by SFWorks was crucial in helping the CBOs move their programs closer to full capacity, an important step toward allowing these organizations to cover their program costs. Yet, capacity-building for CBOs during the pilot phase was mixed at best, and as SFWorks took stock of how it could most effectively support local welfare-to-work efforts, it determined that capacity-building for CBOs would not be a major priority.

First-Year Revenue and Expenses

The first fiscal year of SFWorks (July 1, 1997, to June 30, 1998) included the entire pilot phase and the beginning of the second cycle of trainings (described in the next section). SFWorks during FY1997 had a total of almost $1.3 million in revenue. Inasmuch as SFWorks did not begin receiving ETP payments in FY1997, all revenue for this fiscal year was contributed revenue (as opposed to a combination of contributed and earned revenue). The contributions broke down as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 **San Francisco Works: Contributed Revenue, FY 1997**
(July 1, 1997–June 30, 1998)

Revenue Source	Amount
Foundations	$475,000
Corporations	$771,665
Individuals	$49,211
Total	**$1,295,876**

The foundation support in FY1997 was provided by four organizations: the James Irvine Foundation ($200,000), The Rockefeller Foundation ($125,000), the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation ($100,000), and the F.B. Heron Foundation ($50,000). Corporate support came from 18 of San Francisco's largest employers, whose contributions ranged from $10,000 to $115,000. Many of the foundation and business contributions for FY1997 represented the first year of multi-year commitments to SFWorks.

Table 5 **San Francisco Works: Expenses, FY 1997**
(July 1, 1997–June 30, 1998)

Expense	Amount
Staff payroll	$79,232
Consultants/professional fees	$188,915
Performance-based payment to CBOs	$184,011
Trainee wages	$98,440
Other (equipment purchase, supplies, publications, conferences, local travel)	$111,026
Total	**$661,624**

SFWorks' expenses for FY1997 totaled just over $660,000, which broke down as shown in Table 5.

THE SECOND CYCLE OF SFWORKS

Toward an Employer-Led Approach

Even before the pilot phrase was a month old, and even as SFWorks staff were occupied with placing pilot-phase graduates (well into the summer of 1998), the organization had started laying the groundwork for an aggressive program redesign. Throughout the redesign process, the SFWorks staff focused on implementing some of the key lessons learned from the pilot stage. Chief among these was *the value of creating training curricula that were employer-led and designed with an eye toward specific jobs in specific industries.* Furthermore, instead of selecting training organizations through an open Request for Qualifications, SFWorks hand-picked CBOs to provide training for SFWorks participants.[12] Relatedly, SFWorks tried to move away from the type of micromanagement that had frustrated some of the CBOs during the pilot phase. Thus, with the second cycle of trainings (that is, the first cycle *following* the post-pilot restructuring of the program), SFWorks allowed employers' hiring needs to drive most of the training programs and allowed CBOs greater independence in working with employers to develop curricula to meet these needs.

Although all the training programs in the second cycle were created and implemented in slightly different ways, SFWorks implemented the following general program planning strategies across these different trainings that generally distinguished this planning process from the planning of the pilot phase.

- **Preliminary planning with partner CBOs.** In developing the second cycle of trainings, SFWorks went to great lengths to ensure that CBOs' roles in training—and their expectations of SFWorks—were clearly identified up-front. SFWorks met with staff from the Bar Association of San Francisco's Legal Employment Action Program (LEAP) in May 1998, almost five months before the training program began. (For a closer look at LEAP, see the box on page 25.) In planning the clerical/insurance training, SFWorks met with staff from Women in Community Service (WICS) four months before the initially scheduled (though ultimately postponed) start-up date of August 1998.
- **Obtaining employers' commitment to working with training organizations.** This was a crucial part of developing the training programs. As Jewish Vocational Service had dis-

12. Of the five CBOs that provided training during the pilot, only Jewish Vocational Service received a contract for the second cycle of trainings.

Industry Profile: Creating the Legal Employment Action Program (LEAP)

The Legal Employment Action Program (LEAP) grew out of the Volunteer Legal Services Program (VLSP), the *pro bono* arm of the Bar Association of San Francisco. Under the direction of Tanya Neiman, VLSP had over the years become increasingly interested in how legal issues related to other challenges facing its low-income clients. In November 1997, VLSP convened an advisory board to begin examining how to structure a program for preparing welfare recipients for entry-level jobs in law firms.

About six months later, the Bar Association was approached by SFWorks about creating a legal services training program.* With a preliminary curriculum for a new Legal Employment Action Program (LEAP) already in place, staff from VLSP met with SFWorks in June 1998 to begin discussing the specific structure of the training program. In a departure from the basic model that SFWorks had used during the pilot phase, the Bar Association insisted that intensive training be provided before the start of the paid work experience (PWE). The Bar Association felt this would be necessary not only to adequately prepare the trainees but also to make the program sellable to the law firms, whose support would be crucial to LEAP's success.

To create an in-house staff for LEAP, VLSP hired one staff person to serve as a liaison with the firms and established a contract with the nonprofit Urban University to provide the soft-skills/lifeskills training. VLSP relied on SFWorks to establish a contract with City College of San Francisco for the hard-skills portion of the training. While the details of the training were being worked out, Drucilla Stender Ramey, Executive Director of the Bar Association, secured the participation of 16 firms, all of which agreed to (1) place a LEAP participant in a three-month paid work experience, (2) employ the participant for nine months after that, and (3) provide a mentor within the firm for the LEAP participant.

By late summer of 1998, VLSP and SFWorks settled on a training program that included:

- A two-week appraisal period.
- Six weeks of classroom-based training in soft skills (communication skills, workplace etiquette, etc.) and hard skills (computer hardware and software, keyboarding, etc.).
- 12 weeks of paid work experience (three days a week) concurrent with continued hard-skills/soft-skills training (two days a week).

Of the 27 individuals who started the appraisal period, 23 went on to begin the intensive training. Of this group, 14 individuals completed the training and the internship, and 12 were offered full-time employment. These full-time employment periods all began at approximately the end of February 1999.

*VLSP had applied—through the initial Request for Qualifications process—for participation in the SFWorks pilot phase, but it had not been granted a contract.

covered during the pilot phase in its work with the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center, a connection with the employer makes virtually every part of the training process go more smoothly. With such a link, potential SFWorks participants have a clearer sense of what to expect from the program, paid internships are assured in advance, and employers can make sure that the necessary support systems—like mentoring—are in place.

- **Utilizing the expertise of employers in developing the training curriculum.** Employers can play a vital role in helping training organizations clarify the structure and goals of their job training programs. In addition to conducting job assessments, employers can help identify the specific types of hard skills and soft skills that an industry-specific training curriculum should include. As the second cycle of SFWorks training was taking shape, for instance, Bank of America worked with SFWorks and Jewish Vocational Service to identify the computer skills that SFWorks participants would need in order to work in the bank's branches. (For a closer look at the training program that Bank of America offered in collaboration with Jewish Vocational Service, see the box on page 27.)

- **Developing clear service agreements with training organizations.** In an effort to clarify expectations, SFWorks and training organizations developed a basic service agreement that outlined how the performance-based payment would work and exactly what type of training and retention services would be provided to participants.

The second cycle of trainings called for staggered start-up dates among the various industry-specific training tracks. Table 6, page 28, gives an overview of the training programs offered during this second cycle.

Although the second round of trainings was, as a whole, much more employer-focused than the pilot phase, this was not entirely consistent across the individual training programs. The clinical assistant training, bank trainings, and legal services training all had firmly established ties with an employer or employer group (the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center, Bank of America, and the San Francisco Bar Association, respectively), whereas the clerical skills/insurance and custodial tracks did not. Although SFWorks did provide WICS with one industry contact that led to paid work experience placements, WICS ultimately had to assign a staff person to work jointly with SFWorks to line up these spots.[13] The custodial program, which

13. It must be emphasized that this was more a matter of timing than of industry buy-in. In fact, SFWorks had already established meaningful contact with local insurance companies by the latter part of 1998, thanks to the convening efforts of Russell Sands, Chairman of Aon Risk Services. However, SFWorks had initiated this contact too late for most of the companies to get involved in *this* cycle of training. For the next clerical services/insurance training (which started in April 1999), this employer group committed to providing placements for SFWorks participants.

Company Profile: The Bank of America Training Program

In the spring of 1998, as SFWorks was beginning to look ahead to its second cycle of training, Bank of America approached Jewish Vocational Service (JVS) and SFWorks about doing a bank training program. In this three-way collaboration, SFWorks would provide the funding and the recruitment and assist with planning, curriculum development, and quality control; JVS would provide the program management, training, case management, and nine months of retention services; and Bank of America would provide classroom space and computer use and would commit to on-site training—and potential full-time employment—for trainees. Bank of America also would provide money management training, volunteer mentors (for the post-employment period), and clothing vouchers from Goodwill San Francisco.

JVS, Bank of America, and SFWorks collaborated on two training programs during SFWorks' second cycle of trainings. One was an eight-week training for proof operators.* This training—all of which took place at Bank of America—included a four-week segment on life skills and basic computer skills, followed by four weeks of training in the Bank of America proof operations department. Bank of America also offered a 16-week teller training. The first eight weeks were spent on office technology, computer literacy and applications, customer service skills, and job search skills. The second eight weeks were conducted at Bank of America's teller school and included both classroom training and a paid internship at a bank branch.

Bank of America and JVS placed a great deal of emphasis on individualized support for trainees. JVS staff were available to work with trainees during the paid work experience portion of the training. In addition, Bank of America assigned mentors to work one-on-one with the training participants. Bank of America found this aspect of the program to be crucial, as it provided valuable individual support that helped trainees acculturate to Bank of America's corporate environment.

The Bank of America training programs were intensive yet small. The proof operator training program enrolled nine individuals and graduated seven; four of these were hired immediately—three in proof operations and one in the cash vault department. The teller/customer service program enrolled nine individuals and graduated seven. Of these, five were placed in jobs, including two in departments other than customer service. Bank of America works with SFWorks and the JVS "At Work" program to provide retention services for these employees.

*Bank proof operators use a proof machine to encode items with dollar amounts and to sort items for computer processing. Bank proof operators also balance individual transactions (credits and debits).

SFWorks created to meet the huge demand for this type of training, began while SFWorks was engaged in planning meetings with the hiring hall operated by the local union of building service employees. Called Enquiries, the program was discontinued when the hiring relationship that SFWorks was trying to broker between the union hiring hall and employers did not materialize.[14]

14. This program was discontinued after the training was completed. Placement of participants is being handled by SFWorks' vice president of employment training. As of October 1999, 31 of 47 graduates were placed in jobs.

Table 6 San Francisco Works: Second Cycle of Trainings

Area of Training/ Employer Partner (Where Applicable)	Training Provider	1998 Sept.	1998 Oct.	1998 Nov.	1998 Dec.	1999 Jan.	1999 Feb.	1999 Mar.	1999 Apr.
Clinical assistant/ University of California-San Francisco (UCSF) Medical Center	*Hard skills:* UCSF *Soft skills:* Jewish Vocational Service			11/9			2/19		
Legal services/Bar Association of San Francisco	*Hard skills:* City College of San Francisco *Soft skills:* LEAP/ Urban University		10/13				2/19		
Bank teller/Bank of America	*Hard skills:* Bank of America *Soft skills:* Jewish Vocational Service			11/4			2/26		
Bank proof operator/ Bank of America	*Hard skills:* Bank of America *Soft skills:* Jewish Vocational Service			11/4	12/23				
Clerical skills (insurance industry)	*Hard skills:* City College of San Francisco *Soft skills:* Women in Community Service (WICS)				12/14			3/15	
Custodial (2 sessions)	*Hard skills and soft skills:* Enquiries			11/16	12/8	1/4 1/22			

Recruitment, Orientation, Appraisal

SFWorks continued to operate a centralized recruitment and orientation process. Unlike the pilot-phase recruitment—at which point the Department of Human Services (DHS) CalWORKs plan had not yet been launched—this round of recruitment utilized relationships with DHS's employment specialists, who could refer CalWORKs enrollees to SFWorks as part of their employment plans. Still, recruitment proved to be a hurdle for SFWorks, although the organization did try public outreach as well as recruiting through DHS.

A series of SFWorks orientations in September 1998 attracted a total of 320 people, and attendees could sign up for the training program that interested them. The appraisal phase that followed the orientation differed markedly from appraisal during the pilot phase. Rather than prescribing a lifeskills motivational curriculum for implementation by all the training organizations, SFWorks enabled the training programs—working with employers when possible—to create one-stop testing (in basic skills and job-readiness) appropriate to their respective target industries. SFWorks' training programs enrolled a total of 115 participants during the second cycle, which had a total program capacity of 127 trainees. Three of the five training programs operated below capacity.

An employer group's involvement in a program like LEAP offers a number of advantages. During the appraisal period, participants had the opportunity to tour the law firms and learn what would be expected of them in that particular work environment. Also, this type of program can potentially be brought up to scale more easily than can a single-employer training program, because internships and placements can be spread out among numerous employers. Access to a range of job sites also gives participants some degree of choice concerning their work environment. The liaison to participating firms was described as "crucial" to this program, as it allowed LEAP to provide appropriate retention services and get ongoing feedback from the individual work sites.

Outcomes from the Second Cycle

Although training completion rates for the second cycle of training were substantially higher than for the pilot, results in terms of placement in full-time work were somewhat disappointing. The scale of the second cycle was very small to begin with, and the percentage of program graduates placed in jobs was not high. However, 90-day retention figures for the second cycle of trainings were higher than they had been for the pilot phase.[15] See Table 7.

15. More specifically, the pilot phase's 90-day retention rate was 29 percent (29 participants of 99 total enrollees/terminees); the similar rate for the second cycle (not including the custodial program) was 38 percent (26 of 68 enrollees/terminees).

The San Francisco Bar Association's LEAP program—with its combination of up-front employer commitment, highly desirable legal services positions, and intensive mentoring—placed 86 percent of its training graduates (and 52 percent of its total enrollees) in full-time employment. Although the clerical/insurance program had significant attrition during the training itself, this program placed 75 percent (3 of 4) of its program graduates. The JVS/Bank of

Table 7 San Francisco Works: Outcomes from Second Cycle of Training

Trainer and Position	Program Capacity	Enrollees/ Terminees	Completed Training	Placed in Job	Placement Rate	90-Day Retention	Unit Cost (Through Placement)
Enquiries—two sessions (Custodial)	50	47	47	31	66%	n/a[a]	n/a[a]
JVS/UCSF (Unit coordinator)	15	15	11	5	33%	4[b]	$12,520
JVS/Bank of America (Teller)	15	9	7	5	56%	4[b]	$9,131
JVS/Bank of America (Proof operator)	10	9	6	4	44%	4[b]	$6,525
Volunteer Legal Services Program (LEAP)	25	23	14	12	52%	11	$13,181
Women in Community Service (Clerical/ insurance)	12	12	4	3	25%	3	$34,402
Total	**127**	**115**	**89**	**60**	**52%**[c]	**n/a**[d]	**n/a**[d]

SOURCE: San Francisco Works (September 16, 1999).

NOTES:

[a]These retention figures are not available because graduates of the custodial program have not yet reached the 90-day point in their placements. Also, cost per placement figures are not available because SFWorks staff took over the placement and retention duties after the contract was discontinued—as described elsewhere in this case study.

[b]Denotes estimate.

[c]The total number of people placed in jobs divided by the total number of enrollees/terminees.

[d]Second-cycle totals for 90-day retention and cost per placement are not included because these figures are not presently available from the custodial program.

America bank training programs both had respectable placement rates, although both training programs also had small enrollment numbers.

Special circumstances affected the placement rates for both the JVS/UCSF training and the custodial training program. The JVS/UCSF training had a strong completion rate (11 of 15 enrollees finished the training), but placement efforts were severely hampered by a hiring freeze at UCSF Medical Center. The custodial training program, as noted earlier, was discontinued when the hiring relationship between the union hiring hall and local employers broke down. The custodial program trained a total of 47 individuals, but it took several months before any of these trainees were placed.[16]

Emerging Relationships with Public Sector Partners

The working relationship between SFWorks and the Department of Human Services (DHS) has solidified since the pilot phase. DHS employment specialists are now one of the chief means of referral to SFWorks. CBOs that work with SFWorks recruit training participants through monthly "Provider Showcases" that are held by DHS. These events give CBOs the chance to promote their programs—and their relationships with employers—to DHS employment specialists, an approach that not only boosts recruitment for the CBOs but also fosters a more direct link between CBOs and the employment specialists.

In addition, DHS has benefited from SFWorks' ability to work with employers to create new training programs. John Borelli, CalWORKs Section Manager at DHS, noted that "without SFWorks we would never have had LEAP [the Legal Employment Action Program], which is one of the most popular programs among the CalWORKs population." In fact, DHS is beginning to serve as a funding source for SFWorks. DHS will reimburse SFWorks for 50 percent ($350,000) of the costs for the third cycle of trainings (which was offered during the summer and fall of 1999). In addition, DHS in the future will provide direct funding for the programs that SFWorks created and "incubated" during its second and third cycles of training.

SFWorks has started building a relationship with the Private Industry Council of San Francisco (PICSF) as well. PICSF, working in conjunction with DHS, will be funding, monitoring, and tracking a broader range of services that SFWorks intends to provide to businesses. Plans are currently in place for SFWorks to provide services that help entry-level workers advance in their

16. As already noted, SFWorks had to step in and make the placements for the custodial program. The placement figures in Table 7 (31 of 47 participants) reflect these efforts.

careers *after* they've been placed in jobs. This will include providing individualized services to help these workers be more productive on the job and working with human resources departments to identify career paths for entry-level workers.

Results of ETP Funding

As described earlier, the SFWorks Management Committee's decision to seek funds early on from the state's Employment Training Panel (ETP) was significant in that it introduced public funding into an organization that had prided itself from the start on being financed entirely by the private sector. Ultimately, the tension between SFWorks' emphasis on flexibility in program design and the requirements built into its ETP contract proved highly frustrating for both SFWorks and LETC, the organization that administered the ETP grant.

The SFWorks contract with ETP totaled just over $3.2 million, which included $700,000 in administrative fees to be paid to LETC. SFWorks' ETP contract provided for two different types of training. For the majority of trainees included in the grant (480 of the total 630 projected), the contract funded 180 hours of classroom training and 36 hours of structured on-site training per trainee. For the remaining 150 trainees, the ETP contract called for 270 hours of structured on-site training and 16 hours of classroom training per individual.

The structure of the SFWorks pilot phase generally was in line with ETP requirements for training programs. ETP requires that training be provided to incumbent workers (individuals working on site at least 20 hours a week), while the SFWorks pilot phase had classroom training and the internship begin on the same day.

Yet despite the seemingly compatible structures of the SFWorks pilot and the ETP requirements, SFWorks has received only $100,307 in ETP funds (as of April 1999), just 3 percent of the total amount projected in the contract. SFWorks' lack of access to ETP funds is a result of two major factors:

1. ETP's many requirements, if followed completely, would make SFWorks' employer-led approach unworkable. Following the pilot phase, SFWorks redesigned its training to meet the needs of the major employers it would be working with during the second cycle of training. These employers emphasized the need for classroom-based hard-skills and soft-skills training that occurred *before* placement in internships. SFWorks therefore was faced with a choice between redesigning the program to meet the requirements of ETP or deferring to the needs of the employers. Having learned from the pilot phase the importance of ensuring employer buy-in before the start of training, SFWorks opted for the latter of these

approaches. SFWorks President and CEO Heather Hiles commented, "We structured our training as the employers saw fit, so we haven't been able to apply most of the projected ETP funds."

2. The number of people participating in SFWorks has been lower than originally projected. SFWorks' original application for ETP funds was based on a projected participant base of 2,000 individuals, and ETP provided SFWorks with funding for 630 participants, or almost one-third of this total. With the ETP contract period more than halfway complete, the *total* number of SFWorks enrollees (as of April 1999) was 434. The number enrolled in ETP-eligible training was 246, and providers receive ETP funding only for the number of trainees for whom they can document job placement and at least 90 days of retention. There are two reasons for this shortfall on the number of participants. First, as a new program SFWorks is still figuring out a successful recruitment model, especially in light of the shrinking TANF caseload in San Francisco. Second, SFWorks did not initiative any new training programs during the six months between the pilot's launch and the commencement of the second training cycle, opting instead to use the summer and early fall of 1998 for program development and planning.[17]

As noted in Table 2, training providers receive ETP progress payments based on specific benchmarks: 25 percent of the per participant fixed fee after the first 20 percent of classroom hours are complete, 50 percent at the completion of training, and the remaining 25 percent at 90 days of job retention. ETP funding, however, is an all-or-nothing proposition. The first two payments (of 25 percent and 50 percent) are *advances* on the entire per participant payment and must be returned to ETP if the trainee does not achieve placement and 90 days' retention. *SFWorks has documented 90 days' retention for only 25 ETP-eligible trainees.*[18]

The relationship between SFWorks and LETC, the organization administering the ETP grant, has been strained by SFWorks' lower-than-projected number of ETP-eligible placements. Since LETC's compensation is figured as a percentage of the ETP funds actually paid to SFWorks, LETC has received far less than it had originally projected. As of April 1999, LETC had received

17. SFWorks has also been hurt by ETP's requirement that no more than 20 percent of placements occur at nonprofit organizations or public institutions. ETP's governing statute deems placements at nonprofit hospitals—such as the University of California-San Francisco Medical Center—to be ineligible for ETP funds.

18. According to SFWorks, its experience with ETP funding is not unique. SFWorks notes that no organization that has contracted with ETP for welfare-to-work training has met the placement projections contained in the initial contract. Of course, this may say more about the general wisdom of shifting ETP funds (which traditionally have been used for dislocated workers) into the welfare-to-work pot in the first place—a policy decision that is still a matter of debate.

$25,000 from the SFWorks' ETP contract, or less than 4 percent of the originally projected amount. LETC has expressed frustration that SFWorks didn't ensure that jobs would be waiting for its pilot class and, furthermore, that SFWorks has not recruited more successfully. In addition, Steven Duscha, who administered the SFWorks' contract on behalf of LETC, noted that SFWorks' payment-for-performance model is weighted more heavily toward training and thus does not promote placements as rigorously as does the ETP program.

For its part, SFWorks believes that the stipulations that accompany ETP funding are overly restrictive and that the program burdens the staff of SFWorks and the training providers with undue reporting requirements. SFWorks has joined with staff from the San Francisco Department of Human Services and Jewish Vocational Service to develop a set of proposed amendments to the state law that governs ETP funds. These proposed amendments would change ETP's welfare-to-work program by (1) allowing up to 50 percent (rather than 20 percent) of placements to occur in nonprofit organizations and public institutions, (2) structuring payments to nonprofit agencies as actual incremental payments rather than as an "all-or-nothing" system of progress payments, (3) reducing from 30 to 20 the number of work hours per week required during the retention period, and (4) including training for General Assistance recipients within the scope of ETP-eligible programs.[19]

THE THIRD CYCLE OF SFWORKS

Based on its experience during the second cycle of training, SFWorks determined that recruitment and outreach for future trainings would be decentralized to the training organizations themselves. There were several reasons for this change: (1) with a full-time staff of only five, SFWorks lacked the organizational capacity to undertake recruitment efforts; (2) SFWorks believed that CBOs were better positioned to do the necessary community outreach; (3) CBOs expressed an interest in doing their own outreach to employment specialists at the San Francisco Department of Human Services; and (4) DHS wanted to create more direct linkages between CBOs and the employment specialists.

19. At the same time that it is seeking changes to the ETP program, SFWorks is collaborating with LETC to provide ETP-funded career advancement services to up to 220 individuals. Participants will receive structured on-site training from their employer or from a CBO trainer. SFWorks is contracting with Jewish Vocational Service and Arriba Juntos, another leading employment training organization, on this project.

Third-Cycle Training Programs

SFWorks' third cycle of training got under way in May 1999. These training programs, all of which achieved full enrollment, include the following:

- **Clerical/Insurance.** The Women in Community Service (WICS) Lifeskills Program is providing soft-skills training and has partnered with City College of San Francisco to provide the hard-skills training. This is a 13-week program with paid work experience starting in the latter part of the fourth week. WICS enrolled 20 individuals, graduated 13, and placed 9 in full-time employment.[20]
- **Automotive Services.** SFWorks brought together the Northern California Service League (soft skills), City College of San Francisco (hard skills), and a group of employers in the auto repair field to create this training. This program enrolled 13, graduated 12, and placed 6.
- **Legal Employment Action Program (LEAP).** With 20 law firms committing full-time positions, LEAP enrolled an entering class of 25 individuals. As with its previous training, LEAP is using Urban University for soft skills and City College of San Francisco for hard skills. This round of LEAP graduated 21 and placed all 21 in full-time jobs.
- **Jewish Vocational Service/University of California-San Francisco.** In addition to working with SFWorks on a career advancement/retention contract, JVS has started its third cycle of collaborative work with UCSF Medical Center, which will again provide on-site training and mentors for SFWorks participants. This program enrolled 15 and graduated 8.[21]

Post-Pilot-Phase Revenue and Expenses

SFWorks' second fiscal year (FY1998, beginning July 1, 1998) included the second cycle of trainings and the beginning of the third cycle. Contributed revenue for FY1998 totaled just over $840,000. This figure is down from the FY1997 total of $1,295,876, but SFWorks has lined up several large corporate contributions for the next three years. SFWorks in FY1998 also received $100,307 from the Employment Training Panel, all of which was paid through to training organizations. SFWorks' total FY1998 revenue broke down as shown in Table 8.

SFWorks expenses for FY1998 totaled just under $1.5 million, which broke down as shown in Table 9.

---

20. All graduation and placement figures for the third cycle are current as of October 15, 1999.

21. Graduation for this training program took place on October 18, 1999, and placement figures are not yet available.

Table 8 **San Francisco Works: Revenue, FY 1998**
(July 1, 1998–June 30, 1999)

Source	Amount
Contributed Revenue	
Foundations	$437,500
Corporations	$363,408
Individuals	$40,000
Earned Revenue	
Employment Training Panel	$100,307
Unexpended 1997 Revenue	$634, 253
Total	**$1,575,468**

SOURCE: San Francisco Works.

Table 9 **San Francisco Works: Expenses, FY 1998**
(Beginning July 1, 1998)

Expense	Amount
Staff payroll	$404,163
Consultants/ professional fees	$56,368
Performance-based payment to training organizations	$599,397
Trainee wages and other	$201,840
Other (administration of ETP contract, equipment purchase, supplies, publications, conferences, local travel)	$206,234
LETC (ETP administration)	$24,887
Total	**$1,492,888**[a]

SOURCE: San Francisco Works.
NOTE: [a]After rounding.

SFWORKS: AN UPDATE

Fund Development Efforts

SFWorks initially planned to fund the work of CBOs with more than $2 million in Employment Training Panel (ETP) funds. As described earlier (see "Results of ETP Funding," page 32), SFWorks fell far short of its goals for using ETP funds and, as a result, has had to intensify its fund development efforts. SFWorks' projected budget for FY1999 (beginning July 1, 1999) projects more than $1.8 million in contributed revenue, including more than $1.2 million in projected contributions from foundations. Foundation support for SFWorks includes both unrestricted funds and support that is earmarked for specific activities. General support has come from such organizations as the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr., Fund (which has provided a two-year grant of

$250,000), the Walter and Elise Haas Fund (a two-year, $75,000 grant), the F.B. Heron Foundation ($100,000 over two years), and several others. Earmarked funds include a two-year $100,000 grant from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, much of which will support the enhancement of SFWorks' database and evaluation systems.

Fund development will become increasingly important for SFWorks over the next two years. The organization's contract with ETP expires at the end of March 2000, and it is far from certain that SFWorks will seek a new contract with the panel. Furthermore, by relying heavily on the "2,000 by 2000" slogan in selling the program to businesses early on, SFWorks fixed this date in the minds of many of its business supporters. Several large contributions from businesses are three-year commitments that end in 2000.

In order to meet this challenge, SFWorks has begun targeting a broader base of national foundations. At the same time SFWorks will continue to work through its own Board of Directors as well as the members of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce to identify contacts at businesses and foundations that might support the organization. As SFWorks moves out of its formative stages, furthermore, its Board of Directors will likely begin to take on a more structured role in the area of fundraising. One of the first steps toward this goal would be the formation of a Board fundraising committee, which staff and Board of SFWorks report is under consideration.

Organizational Governance

SFWorks operates under a two-tiered governance structure. The SFWorks Management Committee (comprising Roberta Achtenberg from the Chamber of Commerce, Mark Mosher from the Committee on Jobs, and Sheila Hill-Fajors at the United Way of the Bay Area) reports to the SFWorks Board of Directors, comprising 20 representatives from the founding partners, businesses, and the public sector. Each of the Management Committee members has brought a unique perspective and expertise to the program. In addition to serving as day-to-day supervisor of SFWorks President and CEO Heather Hiles, Achtenberg helps sell the program to business leaders and ensures program investors that SFWorks is using business models to optimize the job training, placement, and retention process. Mosher has helped oversee the ETP contract, raised funds, assisted with troubleshooting, and served as a sounding board for ideas. The United Way's consultative function now focuses more on SFWorks' governance structure than on relationships with CBOs. According to Wilson, SFWorks has evolved to a point where the Board of Directors should now become more active, such as by forming committees to focus on issues like human resources, fund development, strategic planning, and business development.

SFWORKS LOOKS AHEAD

In October 1998, SFWorks staff and Board embarked on a strategic planning process in order to examine how SFWorks should move forward. With extensive assistance from outside firm BTW Consultants, the staff and Board worked to sharpen SFWorks' mission and develop organizational priorities. The strategic plan calls for SFWorks to focus on assisting with—and brokering—businesses' involvement in welfare-to-work. The plan also identifies three objectives: (1) replicating effective models and disseminating best practices, (2) penetrating new sectors and new target populations, and (3) facilitating regional collaborations. The following sections examine some of the major initiatives and challenges that lie before SFWorks.

Increasing Program Capacity

As the numbers presented in Tables 3 and 7 make clear, SFWorks training programs have been quite small. This has been intentional, because SFWorks has taken the approach of trying out new, intensive training programs with relatively small training classes.[22] Yet even with these small target sizes for the training programs, SFWorks has struggled to find enough participants to fill the available slots.

Perhaps the biggest challenge to SFWorks' recruitment efforts is San Francisco's dwindling TANF caseload. In January 1998 (two months before the SFWorks pilot began), the number of nonexempt CalWORKs families in San Francisco stood at 8,109. In January 1999, this figure was 6,630, a decrease of 18 percent over the previous 12 months. While SFWorks tries to maintain its programs at their current enrollment levels (which requires recruiting entire classes of participants), the program is competing for a smaller number of potential participants. In addition, the individuals still on the TANF rolls typically have more barriers to employment than those who have already moved off welfare. These challenges confront all welfare-to-work programs in San Francisco.

At the same time, certain recruitment challenges are more specific to SFWorks. About one-third of the TANF caseload is currently employed, and many of these individuals do not want to leave jobs to enter SFWorks' employer-based training programs, which are full time. Also, virtually all of SFWorks' programs require English skills, while about 40 percent of the TANF caseload

22. No single training program had more than 25 participants, although the custodial training during the second cycle had two classes totaling 47 trainees. Most SFWorks training programs have had 15 or fewer participants.

has a first language other than English. Furthermore, some SFWorks programs—such as the Legal Employment Action Program—have high school diploma/GED requirements that rule out some TANF recipients.

Another obstacle to full recruitment is the pacing of SFWorks' training programs. Within each industry-specific track, training is paced so that a new class starts about every four to five months. From the perspective of the training organizations, structuring training around a group, or "cohort," of trainees is ideal because it allows an organization to operate more cost effectively by bringing a training program to scale.[23] However, this places a significant amount of pressure on CBOs to attract sufficiently large cohorts from DHS, which itself is a "noncohort" system structured around individual employment plans.[24]

In order to boost the number of individuals served by the program, SFWorks faces two hurdles: (1) simply getting more people to sign up for one of its training programs and (2) expanding program capacity. SFWorks plans to address the first of these issues by the following strategies:

- **Implementing decentralized recruiting.** During the pilot phase and second cycle of training, SFWorks oversaw recruitment for its constituent training programs. In moving into its third training cycle, SFWorks relied on CBOs to do their own recruiting. CBOs are free to recruit from their own base of clients, although those wishing to enroll in SFWorks must do so as part of their individual employment plan with DHS. At the same time that SFWorks' partner CBOs use the existing DHS infrastructure to recruit participants specifically for their training programs, SFWorks is using traditional marketing techniques to attract participants. In March 1999, SFWorks launched a multifaceted outreach campaign that includes bus-shelter ads and radio spots.
- **Work with the General Assistance population.** SFWorks plans to expand its program to include General Assistance recipients. This expanded scope of work would allow SFWorks to increase capacity and would mitigate the struggles that SFWorks has had with recruitment. General Assistance—the county-administered "safety net" program that pays benefits to individuals not eligible for state or federal programs—had a caseload of more than 5,000 as of December 1998.

---

23. That is, the program costs involved in training, say, 20 individuals typically do not increase substantially if the cohort is increased to 25.

24. CalWORKs participants are required to develop individual employment plans with employment specialists at DHS.

SFWorks will address the second obstacle described above—increasing overall program capacity—in two primary ways:

- **Piloting training in the technology and telecommunications sectors.** SFWorks believes that its workforce development model (that is, brokering relationships between employers and trainers to create sectoral or company-specific programs) is replicable, and the organization is attempting to find partner businesses in the technology and telecommunications sectors. The technology sector in particular presents a great opportunity for SFWorks, as this industry has driven the Bay Area's recent economic boom and boasts tremendous job growth.
- **Applying industry-specific models to other businesses.** SFWorks President and CEO Heather Hiles has pointed out that the organization's track record within given sectors (health care, banking, etc.) provides SFWorks with the opportunity to work with new employers within those industries. SFWorks is currently exploring partnerships with California Pacific Medical Center (based on the success of the SFWorks' clinical assistant training). SFWorks also plans to replicate the banking services trainings. In spring 1999, SFWorks gave an introductory presentation to a group of San Francisco banks in order to seek new employer partners.

In addition to these strategies, there is another crucial way that SFWorks is working to expand its impact on Bay Area welfare-to-work activities—by providing technical assistance to programs in other Bay Area counties. SFWorks plans to share its expertise in building business partnerships so that its overall program approach—that is, investing in hard-skills training—can be replicated by training providers throughout the region. In addition to opening job opportunities to a broader population of TANF recipients, this type of regional expansion provides an opportunity to coordinate welfare-to-work efforts among different Bay Area counties.[25]

Moving Away from Capacity-Building for CBOs

Building the job training capacity of CBOs was identified as a key objective in SFWorks' original program design. However, building the capacity of CBOs is not currently a high priority, mainly

25. In the spring of 1999, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce's chair-elect, a senior executive at AT&T Cable, enlisted SFWorks to provide technical assistance for the training and hiring of up to 400 entry-level cable installer and customer service jobs in Contra Costa County (another East Bay county).

because SFWorks is limited in its ability to focus on that. SFWorks sees its chief functions as bringing businesses into the welfare-to-work efforts and helping CBOs design training programs to meet the needs of employers, and it generally focuses its limited staff and organizational resources on these objectives.

Still, SFWorks staff work very closely with partner CBOs and have provided them with valuable technical assistance in cost projections, budget planning, and evaluation. In addition, SFWorks' increased ability to work with businesses supports CBOs' efforts in some important ways. Relationships that SFWorks brokers between CBOs and businesses have tremendous value beyond SFWorks itself because CBOs can leverage these relationships in training programs operated under other funding sources. Also, the employer-led curriculum planning strengthens the training programs of SFWorks partner CBOs by making the entire curriculum speak directly to the demands of the workplace.

Conclusion

San Francisco Works in late 1999 can perhaps best be described as an organization solidifying its role in San Francisco's welfare-to-work efforts. The organization has worked with training organizations to develop viable programs for transitioning individuals into desirable entry-level jobs. Perhaps most important, SFWorks has created models for how relationships can be brokered between businesses and CBOs in order to more directly link training and job market needs. These are important successes. Yet at the same time, SFWorks recognizes that its current niche (that is, funding a range of comprehensive sectoral training programs) is not sustainable over the long term. The programs are very expensive, and SFWorks has struggled to keep its programs at full capacity. In addition, with TANF caseloads in San Francisco on the decline, individuals with multiple barriers to employment (lack of marketable skills, mental illness, histories of substance abuse, minimal knowledge of English, etc.) will compose a larger proportion of the TANF rolls. Consequently, SFWorks' job training approach—which uses intensive training to prepare individuals for entry-level jobs after two to three months—will likely be appropriate for an ever decreasing segment of the TANF population.

The way that SFWorks is now working closely with the San Francisco Department of Human Services says a lot about SFWorks' experience during its first years of operation. DHS's decision to provide $350,000 in funding for SFWorks' third cycle of training—as well as to directly fund

four programs that SFWorks helps to create and grow—speaks to SFWorks' ability to serve as an incubator of high-quality training programs. This is a significant development for SFWorks, especially given the low placement numbers it posted for the pilot phase and the second cycle of trainings. In addition, SFWorks' plans to work with DHS and the Private Industry Council of San Francisco to provide career advancement services will leverage the access that SFWorks has to private sector employers and, at the same time, broaden the services available to workers *and* to businesses.

SFWorks' current program design (that is, the employer-focused trainings offered through CBOs) and the future plans described above point to the key outcomes of SFWorks' initial phases. First, SFWorks has discovered its core competencies: creating partnerships between the business sector and training organizations, providing technical assistance to training programs, obtaining business buy-in to local welfare-to-work efforts, understanding job market demands, and serving as an incubator for new training programs. Second, and perhaps more important, SFWorks is learning how to situate its work within broader welfare-to-work efforts and how business-backed welfare-to-work efforts can work closely with—rather than outside of—public workforce development systems.

Recent Publications on MDRC Projects

Note: For works not published by MDRC, the publisher's name is shown in parentheses. A complete publications list is available from MDRC and on its Web site (www.mdrc.org), which also contains copies of MDRC's publications.

Employment and Community Initiatives

Connections to Work Project

A study of local efforts to increase competition in the choice of providers of employment services for welfare recipients and other low-income populations. The project also provides assistance to cutting-edge local initiatives aimed at helping such people access and secure jobs.

Tulsa's IndEx Program: A Business-Led Initiative for Welfare Reform and Economic Development. 1997. Maria Buck.

Washington Works: Sustaining a Vision of Welfare Reform Based on Personal Change, Work Preparation, and Employer Involvement. 1998. Susan Gooden.

Cost Analysis Step by Step: A How-to Guide for Planners and Providers of Welfare-to-Work and Other Employment and Training Programs. 1998. David Greenberg, Ute Appenzeller.

Designing and Administering a Wage-Paying Community Service Employment Program Under TANF: Some Considerations and Choices. 1999. Kay Sherwood.

San Francisco Works: Toward an Employer-Led Approach to Welfare Reform and Workforce Development. 2000. Steven Bliss.

Jobs-Plus Initiative

A multi-site effort to greatly increase employment among public housing residents.

A Research Framework for Evaluating Jobs-Plus, a Saturation and Place-Based Employment Initiative for Public Housing Residents. 1998. James Riccio.

Mobilizing Public Housing Communities for Work: Origins and Early Accomplishments of the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 1999. James Riccio.

Building a Convincing Test of a Public Housing Employment Program Using Non-Experimental Methods: Planning for the Jobs Plus Demonstration. 1999. Howard Bloom.

Section 3 Public Housing Study

An examination of the effectiveness of Section 3 of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act in affording employment opportunities for public housing residents.

Lessons from the Field on the Implementation of Section 3 (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development). 1996. Maxine Bailey, Suzanne Lynn.

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project

A test of an innovative financial incentive intended to expedite the reemployment of displaced workers and encourage full-year work by seasonal or part-year workers, thereby also reducing receipt of Unemployment Insurance.

Implementing the Earnings Supplement Project: A Test of a Re-employment Incentive (Social Research and Demonstration Corporation). 1997. Howard Bloom, Barbara Fink, Susanna Lui-Gurr, Wendy Bancroft, Doug Tattrie.

Testing a Re-employment Incentive for Displaced Workers: The Earnings Supplement Project. 1999. Howard Bloom, Saul Schwartz, Susanna Lui-Gurr, Suk-Won Lee.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reforming Welfare and Making Work Pay

ReWORKing Welfare: Technical Assistance for States and Localities

A multifaceted effort to assist states and localities in designing and implementing their welfare reform programs. The project includes a series of "how-to" guides, conferences, briefings, and customized, in-depth technical assistance.

After AFDC: Welfare-to-Work Choices and Challenges for States. 1997. Dan Bloom.
Changing to a Work First Strategy: Lessons from Los Angeles County's GAIN Program for Welfare Recipients. 1997. Evan Weissman.
Work First: How to Implement an Employment-Focused Approach to Welfare Reform. 1997. Amy Brown.
Business Partnerships: How to Involve Employers in Welfare Reform. 1998. Amy Brown, Maria Buck, Erik Skinner.
Learnfare: How to Implement a Mandatory Stay-in-School Program for Teenage Parents on Welfare. 1998. David Long, Johannes Bos.
Promoting Participation: How to Increase Involvement in Welfare-to-Work Activities. 1999. Gayle Hamilton, Susan Scrivener.
Encouraging Work, Reducing Poverty: The Impact of Work Incentive Programs. 2000. Gordon Berlin.

Project on Devolution and Urban Change

A multi-year study in four major urban counties — Cuyahoga County, Ohio (which includes the city of Cleveland), Los Angeles, Miami-Dade, and Philadelphia — that examines how welfare reforms are being implemented and affect poor people, their neighborhoods, and the institutions that serve them.

Big Cities and Welfare Reform: Early Implementation and Ethnographic Findings from the Project on Devolution and Urban Change. 1999. Janet Quint, Kathryn Edin, Maria Buck, Barbara Fink, Yolanda Padilla, Olis Simmons-Hewitt, Mary Valmont.

Time Limits

Cross-State Study of Time-Limited Welfare

An examination of the implementation of some of the first state-initiated time-limited welfare programs.

Implementing Time-Limited Welfare: Early Experiences in Three States. 1995. Dan Bloom, David Butler.
The View from the Field: As Time Limits Approach, Welfare Recipients and Staff Talk About Their Attitudes and Expectations. 1997. Amy Brown, Dan Bloom, David Butler.
Welfare Time Limits: An Interim Report Card. 1999. Dan Bloom.

Connecticut's Jobs First Program

An evaluation of Connecticut's statewide time-limited welfare program, which includes financial work incentives and requirements to participate in employment-related services aimed at rapid job placement. This study provides some of the earliest information on the effects of time limits in major urban areas.

Jobs First: Early Implementation of Connecticut's Welfare Reform Initiative. 1998. Dan Bloom, Mary Andes, Claudia Nicholson.
Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Three-Month Survey Results. 1998. Jo Anna Hunter-Manns, Dan Bloom, Richard Hendra, Johanna Walter.
Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Six-Month Survey Results. 1999. Jo Anna Hunter-Manns, Dan Bloom.
Jobs First: Implementation and Early Impacts of Connecticut's Welfare Reform Initiative. 2000. Dan Bloom, Laura Melton, Charles Michalopoulos, Susan Scrivener, Johanna Walter.

Florida's Family Transition Program

An evaluation of Florida's initial time-limited welfare program, which includes services, requirements, and financial work incentives intended to reduce long-term welfare receipt and help welfare recipients find and keep jobs.

The Family Transition Program: An Early Implementation Report on Florida's Time-Limited Welfare Initiative. 1995. Dan Bloom.
The Family Transition Program: Implementation and Early Impacts of Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program. 1997. Dan Bloom, James Kemple, Robin Rogers-Dillon.
The Family Transition Program: Implementation and Interim Impacts of Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program. 1998. Dan Bloom, Mary Farrell, James Kemple, Nandita Verma.

The Family Transition Program: Implementation and Three-Year Impacts of Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program. 1999. Dan Bloom, Mary Farrell, James Kemple, Nandita Verma.

Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project

An evaluation of Vermont's statewide welfare reform program, which includes a work requirement after a certain period of welfare receipt, and financial work incentives.

WRP: Implementation and Early Impacts of Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project. 1998. Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, Johanna Walter, Patricia Auspos.

Financial Incentives

Encouraging Work, Reducing Poverty: The Impact of Work Incentive Programs. 2000. Gordon Berlin.

Minnesota Family Investment Program

An evaluation of Minnesota's welfare reform initiative, which aims to encourage work, alleviate poverty, and reduce welfare dependence.

MFIP: An Early Report on Minnesota's Approach to Welfare Reform. 1995. Virginia Knox, Amy Brown, Winston Lin.
Making Welfare Work and Work Pay: Implementation and 18-Month Impacts of the Minnesota Family Investment Program. 1997. Cynthia Miller, Virginia Knox, Patricia Auspos, Jo Anna Hunter-Manns, Alan Orenstein.

New Hope Project

A test of a community-based, work-focused antipoverty program and welfare alternative operating in Milwaukee.

The New Hope Offer: Participants in the New Hope Demonstration Discuss Work, Family, and Self-Sufficiency. 1996. Dudley Benoit.
Creating New Hope: Implementation of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare. 1997. Thomas Brock, Fred Doolittle, Veronica Fellerath, Michael Wiseman.
Who Got New Hope? 1997. Michael Wiseman.
An Early Look at Community Service Jobs in the New Hope Demonstration. 1998. Susan Poglinco, Julian Brash, Robert Granger.
New Hope for People with Low Incomes: Two-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare. 1999. Johannes Bos, Aletha Huston, Robert Granger, Greg Duncan, Thomas Brock, Vonnie McLoyd.

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project

A test of the effectiveness of a temporary earnings supplement on the employment and welfare receipt of public assistance recipients. Reports on the Self-Sufficiency Project are available from: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation (SRDC), 275 Slater St., Suite 900, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H9, Canada. Tel.: 613-237-4311; Fax: 613-237-5045. In the United States, the reports are also available from MDRC.

Creating an Alternative to Welfare: First-Year Findings on the Implementation, Welfare Impacts, and Costs of the Self-Sufficiency Project (Social Research and Demonstration Corporation [SRDC]). 1995. Tod Mijanovich, David Long.
The Struggle for Self-Sufficiency: Participants in the Self-Sufficiency Project Talk About Work, Welfare, and Their Futures (SRDC). 1995. Wendy Bancroft, Sheila Currie Vernon.
Do Financial Incentives Encourage Welfare Recipients to Work? Initial 18-Month Findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project (SRDC). 1996. David Card, Philip Robins.
When Work Pays Better Than Welfare: A Summary of the Self-Sufficiency Project's Implementation, Focus Group, and Initial 18 Month Impact Reports (SRDC). 1996.
How Important Are "Entry Effects" in Financial Incentive Programs for Welfare Recipients? Experimental Evidence from the Self-Sufficiency Project (SRDC). 1997. David Card, Philip Robins, Winston Lin.
Do Work Incentives Have Unintended Consequences? Measuring "Entry Effects" in the Self-Sufficiency Project (SRDC). 1998. Gordon Berlin, Wendy Bancroft, David Card, Winston Lin, Philip Robins.
When Financial Incentives Encourage Work: Complete 18-Month Findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project. 1998. Winston Lin, Philip Robins, David Card, Kristen Harknett, Susanna Lui-Gurr.
Does SSP Plus Increase Employment? The Effect of Adding Services to the Self-Sufficiency Project's Financial Incentives. 1999. Gail Quets, Philip Robins, Elsie Pan, Charles Michalopoulos, David Card.
When Financial Work Incentives Pay for Themselves: Early Findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project's Applicant Study. 1999. Charles Michalopoulos, Philip Robins, David Card.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mandatory Welfare Employment Programs

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies

A large-scale study (formerly known as the JOBS Evaluation) of different strategies for moving people from welfare to employment.

Adult Education for People on AFDC: A Synthesis of Research (U.S. Department of Education [ED]/U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [HHS]). 1995. Edward Pauly.

Early Findings on Program Impacts in Three Sites (HHS/ED). 1995. Stephen Freedman, Daniel Friedlander.

Five Years After: The Long-Term Effects of Welfare-to-Work Programs (Russell Sage Foundation). 1995. Daniel Friedlander, Gary Burtless.

Monthly Participation Rates in Three Sites and Factors Affecting Participation Levels in Welfare-to-Work Programs (HHS/ED). 1995. Gayle Hamilton.

Changing to a Work First Strategy: Lessons from Los Angeles County's GAIN Program for Welfare Recipients. 1997. Evan Weissman.

Evaluating Two Welfare-to-Work Program Approaches: Two-Year Findings on the Labor Force Attachment and Human Capital Development Programs in Three Sites (HHS/ED). 1997. Gayle Hamilton, Thomas Brock, Mary Farrell, Daniel Friedlander, Kristen Harknett.

Work First: How to Implement an Employment-Focused Approach to Welfare Reform. 1997. Amy Brown.

Implementation, Participation Patterns, Costs, and Two-Year Impacts of the Portland (Oregon) Welfare-to-Work Program (HHS/ED). 1998. Susan Scrivener, Gayle Hamilton, Mary Farrell, Stephen Freedman, Daniel Friedlander, Marisa Mitchell, Jodi Nudelman, Christine Schwartz.

Los Angeles's Jobs-First GAIN Program

An evaluation of Los Angeles's refocused GAIN (welfare-to-work) program, which emphasizes rapid employment. This is the first in-depth study of a full-scale "work first" program in one of the nation's largest urban areas.

Changing to a Work First Strategy: Lessons from Los Angeles County's GAIN Program for Welfare Recipients. 1997. Evan Weissman.

The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN Evaluation: Preliminary Findings on Participation Patterns and First-Year Impacts. 1998. Stephen Freedman, Marisa Mitchell, David Navarro.

The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN Evaluation: First-Year Findings on Participation Patterns and Impacts. 1999. Stephen Freedman, Marisa Mitchell, David Navarro.

Teen Parents on Welfare

Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis of the Long-Term Effects of the New Chance Demonstration, Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program, and the Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD). 1998. Robert Granger, Rachel Cytron.

Ohio's LEAP Program

An evaluation of Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program, which uses financial incentives to encourage teenage parents on welfare to stay in or return to school.

LEAP: Final Report on Ohio's Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents. 1997. Johannes Bos, Veronica Fellerath.

New Chance Demonstration

A test of a comprehensive program of services that seeks to improve the economic status and general well-being of a group of highly disadvantaged young women and their children.

New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and Their Children. 1997. Janet Quint, Johannes Bos, Denise Polit.

Parenting Behavior in a Sample of Young Mothers in Poverty: Results of the New Chance Observational Study. 1998. Martha Zaslow, Carolyn Eldred, editors.

Focusing on Fathers

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration

A demonstration for unemployed noncustodial parents (usually fathers) of children on welfare. PFS aims to improve the men's employment and earnings, reduce child poverty by increasing child support payments, and assist the fathers in playing a broader constructive role in their children's lives.

Low-Income Parents and the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration. 1996. Earl Johnson, Fred Doolittle.
Working with Low-Income Cases: Lessons for the Child Support Enforcement System from Parents' Fair Share. 1998. Fred Doolittle, Suzanne Lynn.
Building Opportunities, Enforcing Obligations: Implementation and Interim Impacts of Parents' Fair Share. 1998. Fred Doolittle, Virginia Knox, Cynthia Miller, Sharon Rowser.
Fathers' Fair Share: Helping Poor Men Manage Child Support and Fatherhood (Russell Sage Foundation). 1999. Earl Johnson, Ann Levine, Fred Doolittle.

Other

Can They All Work? A Study of the Employment Potential of Welfare Recipients in a Welfare-to-Work Program. 1995. James Riccio, Stephen Freedman.
Florida's Project Independence: Benefits, Costs, and Two-Year Impacts of Florida's JOBS Program. 1995. James Kemple, Daniel Friedlander, Veronica Fellerath.
From Welfare to Work Among Lone Parents in Britain: Lessons for America. 1996. James Riccio.

Education Reform

Career Academies

The largest and most comprehensive evaluation of a school-to-work initiative, this 10-site study examines a promising approach to high school restructuring and the school-to-work transition.

Career Academies: Early Implementation Lessons from a 10-Site Evaluation. 1996. James Kemple, JoAnn Leah Rock.
Career Academies: Communities of Support for Students and Teachers — Emerging Findings from a 10-Site Evaluation. 1997. James Kemple.
Career Academies: Building Career Awareness and Work-Based Learning Activities Through Employer Partnerships. 1999. James Kemple, Susan Poglinco, Jason Snipes.
Career Academies: Impacts on Students' Engagement and Performance in High School. 2000. James Kemple, Jason Snipes.

School-to-Work Project

A study of innovative programs that help students make the transition from school to work or careers.

Home-Grown Lessons: Innovative Programs Linking School and Work (Jossey-Bass Publishers). 1995. Edward Pauly, Hilary Kopp, Joshua Haimson.
Home-Grown Progress: The Evolution of Innovative School-to-Work Programs. 1997. Rachel Pedraza, Edward Pauly, Hilary Kopp.

Project Transition

A demonstration program that tested a combination of school-based strategies to facilitate students' transition from middle school to high school.

Project Transition: Testing an Intervention to Help High School Freshmen Succeed. 1999. Janet Quint, Cynthia Miller, Jennifer Pastor, Rachel Cytron.

Equity 2000

Equity 2000 is a nationwide initiative sponsored by the College Board to improve low-income students' access to college. The MDRC paper examines the implementation of Equity 2000 in Milwaukee Public Schools.

Getting to the Right Algebra: The Equity 2000 Initiative in Milwaukee Public Schools. 1999. Sandra Ham, Erica Walker.

MDRC Working Papers on Research Methodology

A new series of papers that explore alternative methods of examining the implementation and impacts of programs and policies.

Building a Convincing Test of a Public Housing Employment Program Using Non-Experimental Methods: Planning for the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 1999. Howard Bloom.
Estimating Program Impacts on Student Achievement Using "Short" Interrupted Time Series. 1999. Howard Bloom.
Using Cluster Random Assignment to Measure Program Impacts: Statistical Implications for the Evaluation of Education Programs. 1999. Howard Bloom, Johannes Bos, Suk-Won Lee.

About MDRC

The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan social policy research organization. We are dedicated to learning what works to improve the well-being of low-income people. Through our research and the active communication of our findings, we seek to enhance the effectiveness of social policies and programs. MDRC was founded in 1974 and is located in New York City and San Francisco.

MDRC's current projects focus on welfare and economic security, education, and employment and community initiatives. Complementing our evaluations of a wide range of welfare reforms are new studies of supports for the working poor and emerging analyses of how programs affect children's development and their families' well-being. In the field of education, we are testing reforms aimed at improving the performance of public schools, especially in urban areas. Finally, our community projects are using innovative approaches to increase employment in low-income neighborhoods.

Our projects are a mix of demonstrations field—tests of promising program models—and evaluations of government and community initiatives, and we employ a wide range of methods such as large-scale studies to determine a program's effects, surveys, case studies, and ethnographies of individuals and families. We share the findings and lessons from our work—including best practices for program operators—with a broad audience within the policy and practitioner community, as well as the general public and the media.

Over the past quarter century, MDRC has worked in almost every state, all of the nation's largest cities, and Canada. We conduct our projects in partnership with state and local governments, the federal government, public school systems, community organizations, and numerous private philanthropies.

MDRC

16 East 34 Street
New York, New York 10016
(212) 532-3200

www.mdrc.org

88 Kearny Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94108
(415) 781-3800